

ANNEXATION  
OF  
THE TEXAS,

CASE OF WAR

BETWEEN

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

“I know nothing greater or nobler than the undertaking and managing some important accusation, by which some high criminal of State, or some formed body of conspirators against the public, may be arraigned and brought to punishment, through the honest zeal and public affection of a private man.”—*Lord Shaftesbury.*

BY

D. URQUHART, ESQ.

LONDON:

JAMES MAYNARD, PANTON STREET, HAYMARKET.

1844.



## CONTENTS.

|                                                                                          | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Settlement of Texas—Its Revolution and Independence . . . . .                            | 9    |
| Engagements of Mexico to England . . . . .                                               | 17   |
| Recognition of Texas by England . . . . .                                                | 21   |
| Treaty between Great Britain and Texas . . . . .                                         | 22   |
| Mexican Protest . . . . .                                                                | 30   |
| Recognition by Great Britain of the Revolted American<br>Colonies of Spain . . . . .     | 32   |
| Conduct of England towards Texas and Mexico, under the<br>New Administration . . . . .   | 48   |
| Treaty between Texas and the United States . . . . .                                     | 54   |
| Means used by the United States' Government to obtain the<br>Treaty from Texas . . . . . | 63   |
| War between the United States and Mexico . . . . .                                       | 70   |
| Dr. Channing in 1834, on the Annexation of Texas . . . . .                               | 93   |
| From the "Boundary Differences" in 1838 . . . . .                                        | 98   |



## ANNEXATION OF THE TEXAS,

ETC. ETC.

THE great Felony has been consummated. As pirates in disguise steal into a fortress to surprise by cunning, when they cannot overcome by force, so did bands of American outlaws enter the territories of their neighbour; and though the lifetime of half a generation has passed between the beginning and the end—the original purpose is proved and crowned by the present result.

When it was suspected that the American Union might not prove the tranquil neighbour and peaceful community of which she then wore the complacent aspect—when it was doubtingly whispered that there might be something under the Texan colonization—the Government and people of the United States resented the suspicion as an insult. They pleaded “constitutional difficulties,” and the inability of the executive to put down the lawlessness of their southern border; but they declared that never should the Government of the United States countenance such deeds or profit by them. They were believed. Belief is rife in these times—for phrases. The robbery went on, and the world now beholds the consummation. That consummation produces no abhorrence, not even surprise;—but it was not so when these treacheries commenced—unheeded



when accomplished, they would have been impracticable in their origin could they have been suspected.

The hordes thus engaged seemed to have united every vicious dexterity, and to have expelled every compensating virtue. By crimes committed, and immoral and hateful principles proclaimed, they gained favour among the nation they had left, inveigled new adventurers, and disseminating over the whole Union the virus of this envenomed corruption, they made it directly participate in their profits and their joys. Scrip was circulated for land, to be robbed after it had been purchased, the free States rejoiced that real republicanism was to be extended southward, and the slave-holding States that new strength was to be acquired by slavery; for all there was consideration and aggrandisement, trade and profits. Each separate lust, immorality, or folly was called into play to impel the whole Union into the paths of lawless ambition. Gamblers without adventure—adventurers without faith—stock-jobbers without capital—patriots without a country—hucksters without industry—pirates without discipline—pretenders without belief—pilferers without shame—became to the United States guides, benefactors and examples!

Tens of thousands of these enlightened citizens colonized Texas; repudiated Mexico, and called it a revolution. Bands of sympathisers pressed forward, bearing banners inscribed with “Freedom,” “Liberty,” “Land,” and “Slavery”—the glorious revolution was paraded through Europe—a “rising State” was to be hailed and encouraged, liberalism rejoiced, benevolence commended, and “the independence of Texas,” from being the theme of philosophic applause, became the pivot of political evolutions. Diplomatic support sprung from the states of Europe, and especially from that State, from which alone they had to anticipate repression and punishment. Eng-



land stepped forth to treat with Texas, waving those rights supposed most dear to her, to facilitate for the freebooters the slavery schemes that rendered their plot chiefly detestable, and gave it support in the neighbouring States of the Union. The Americans now learned the power of lying words, and discovered the means of obtaining the favour of England—but, indeed, they had made the discovery before, and applied it to herself.

This insurrection had no subliming touch of daring; it was as cowardly as wicked. Mexico to them was a region of golden dreams, which might be obtained safely by cheating each other into contempt for its rights, and hatred for its owners. The Mexicans were the descendants of the old Spaniards, a worn out and decrepid race, ignorant, idle, priest-ridden, poverty-stricken, a disgrace to the name of republicans, and an incubus on the fairest region of the earth. It was “the mission of the Anglo-Saxon race”\* to drive forth the mongrel breed of Indian and Spaniard. It was their duty to root out antiquated superstitions. “God and Nature” had marked out these possessions as their inheritance. By such blasphemies, more awful than the atrocious deeds which they had been used to prompt, was conscience stifled, and pollution poured forth over the land of America, which generations of retributive agonies will not expiate.

Let not this national crime be compared with those of France in the 18th century, of the Moguls in the 13th, or of the English in the 19th. In France an enslaved people was organized, and did not know what it was about. The Moguls rushed forward, daring and conscious, with that sense of justice that robbers

\* An Englishman in Texas, anticipating Sir R. Peel, speaks of the “acquisitive tendency of the Anglo-Saxon race,” as the principle directing the events of the Western Hemisphere.



present,\* and obedient to the laws they had given themselves, and to the rulers they had set up. England, too, in evil ignorance, but not with evil purpose, has perpetrated her crimes, and would, with joy and exultation, regain her former virtue, could she but find an honest leader among her people. But the United States have neither been slaves, nor coerced, deceived, or heedless men; nor have they been plunderers that avowed their purpose, and joined each other to share uprightly, both risk and profit. Abhorrence is too feeble a term for conduct such as theirs—loathing and disgust alone fills the mind at the contemplation of such atrocities. Such a race has to be cast out like lepers from the society of man; to such death itself is an escape and not a punishment. These are not phrases adjusted to belie integrity, nor are they epithets selected to deepen the die even of recognized guilt; our expressions cannot reach the reality, and in what we say, we but find words for their deeds. Yet they have been made what they are by England.

There has been one distinguished son of America who has long ago placed upon record his abhorrence of such acts, and his prognostication of the consequences; not reviling in hatred, but in sorrow labouring to stay sin and avert calamity. We subjoin the words of Dr. Channing,† and entreat for them the most earnest attention, for they are worth all that has for twenty years been written in Europe.

In face of such warnings, was the design prosecuted and is now completed. *We*, indeed, have looked to this event as one ensured in proper season by that diplomacy that rules the world. Texas and then Canada stood to the United States, as Algiers and then Tunis to France,—Serbia to Austria,—the small States of Germany to

\* “There can even be no robbery without justice,” says St. Augustin, “for how otherwise should they divide the booty?”

† They will be found at the end of this article.



Prussia,—Scinde and Lahore to England: that is, as temptations to which Russia should direct their covetousness,\* and thereby pervert their minds and lead them into crime, so that the injured should find no protector; that all should be confusion, until mutual animosity and rancour, turned against each other the blood-thirstiness that they had learnt to practise upon the weak and honest. Looking from this point of view at the present event, we see rather subject of congratulation than of regret, for it has come before its time. There is not at present a willing or conscious instrument of Russia, minister either of England or France. Mexico is not yet altogether cowed, and may have the courage to make a stand—Canada is not yet in insurrection—the parties in America have not concurred in the resolution for the annexation of Texas; none of the parties have adopted it; on the contrary, their leading men oppose it. Clay,† Webster, and Van Buren declare it immoral, inexpedient, and uncalled for by public opinion; they point it out as dangerous to themselves, without any reference to foreign dangers; they speak even of the dissolution of their own constitution and state as a consequence of it. How, then, has it occurred? A man, by accident raised to the chief magistracy, not a leader of either party, and having made himself obnoxious to all, grasps as he retires from office at this only unoccupied

\* “They,” the allies of Philip, “were gratified for a time with the possession of the territories of others, to be in the end deprived of their own.”—DEMOSTHENES.

† “I consider the annexation of Texas at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure compromising the national character, involving us certainly in a war with Mexico, probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and *not called for* by any general expression of *public opinion*.”—as if that were reason!



position. After his son has for years, with strangely unpunished and unblushing daring, worked up the worst passions, preaching conquest, blood and treachery, he himself, in the last hour of his presidential existence, makes this desperate throw for future popularity and power.\* Alas! in America, as in England, the days of impeachment are gone by; and there, too, while petty offences are pursued with the greatest severity, the greatest of crimes are certain of impunity, and become instruments of success.

Forced on thus, before its time, that is before England is bereft of her strength and alliances in America, or overtaken by European dangers and colonial insurrection—the British Government may be tempted by the want of national support to this measure in the United States, or impelled by the necessity of doing something to maintain character, or *embarrassed* by the resistance of Mexico,—and thus may cease for once to confide to events the care of overcoming difficulties. Or Britain shall appear the camel crouching for a speculator in American politics to mount. Such a phantasm reflected back on her own eye from the mirage of the world's opinion, may shame her even yet.

\* “It should, however, be borne in mind, that this appeal to public opinion is not only a circumstance in the case, but the main object of the whole proceeding. Mr. Tyler and his profligate Cabinet care very little whether they succeed in the annexation of Texas by the aid of public opinion, but they hope to bend public opinion to their interests by the project for the annexation of Texas. Viewed in its true light, this act of the Republican Richelieus is the sublimest point of corruption. We have had many monsters in our days—monster concerts, monster meetings, the monster mortar—and this is the monster BRIBE—a bribe offered in one huge lump to 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 of people—slavery and lands for the south, trade and market for the north—aggrandizement for the whole Union. ‘Vote for President Tyler, and all this is yours.’”—*Times*.



SETTLEMENT OF TEXAS—ITS REVOLUTION AND  
INDEPENDENCE.

The State of Cohahuila and Texas, in order to invite settlers for its spacious domains, passed, with the concurrence of the general Government, laws and regulations to admit colonists without any restrictions, and granting to every applicant vacant lands on the most liberal scale. The profession of Catholicism, required in the other States of Mexico, was here dispensed with. The only obligation imposed on settlers was an oath of allegiance to the Republic, and obedience to the laws of Mexico. The *sale and purchase of slaves was strictly forbidden, on the penalty* (should this condition of their settlement be violated) of FORFEITING THEIR LANDS. Under these hospitable enactments, numbers flocked from the United States, and had lands assigned them free from all charge. No taxes were imposed upon them.

A civil contest subsequently arose, through the desire on the part of many in the Mexican republic to do away with federal institutions in favour of a central government; the citizens of Texas, whether natives or foreign settlers, although marking their preference to federal institutions, abstained from embroiling themselves in this domestic feud.

The rising prosperity of the early settlers attracted a new class of emigrants, from the very refuse of the United States. These, impatient of steady industry, began to look with distaste on the laws of Mexico forbidding slavery, and its rights of ownership; they from thenceforth laboured to produce confusion, and the project was formed of robbing Mexico of the province, and of tempting adventurers to their support, by proposing to throw it into the arms of the United States.

To accomplish this, land speculations were organized;



and while the attention of the central government was occupied with the civil commotions which unhappily prevailed throughout Mexico, they succeeded in introducing cargoes of slaves.

The feelings and views of these men were in no way shared by the original settlers from the United States, so that their first steps were stealthy. In 1832, on the strength of some grievances, of which the Texans then complained, they commenced with putting forth the scheme of a separation between Texas and Cohahuila. A constitution having been drawn up, a convention was held in Texas to petition the Sovereign Congress to sanction it, and to receive them into the Mexican confederation as a separate State. In this document, it is said, "The people of Texas present the strongest assurances of their patriotic attachment to the constitution and to the republic, pledging all and every interest in life for the support of their declaration." From this passage it will be seen, that the general concurrence had been obtained, by the concealment of their design.

Colonel Austin, charged with the mission of urging at the capital the adoption of the prayer of the petition, returned in 1834, with very different views. In the letter, of the 25th August, announcing the conclusion of his mission, he says—

"The Government have remedied the evils complained of in Texas, and which threatened it with ruin; and *those who acted LAST YEAR in GOOD FAITH, and with pure intentions of separating from Cohahuila, are now opposed to it*, because the reasons which made a separation necessary no longer exist." Colonel Austin proceeded to advise, that "a public act of gratitude should be expressed by the people for those remedies that have been applied by the State and General Government," and counselled the Texans to "discountenance in the most unequivocal



manner," all "inflammatory men," "political adventurers," "would-be-great-men," and "vain tattlers," and that they should "proclaim, with one unanimous voice, FIDELITY TO MEXICO, OPPOSITION TO VIOLENT MEN AND MEASURES,—and it will be peace and prosperity to Texas."

Foiled by this unexpected result, the malcontents then alleged the fact of the existence of disunion and civil war in the republic, as a reason for accomplishing their separation from it.

These machinations were again counteracted by the efforts and decisions of the loyal and respectable inhabitants of the province, and public tranquillity was restored.

We subjoin an extract from the address of the central Committee of Texas, which, while establishing the most flagrant case that ever was made out against the infatuation of revolution, and the guilt of treason, is a testimony to the mildness, humanity, and excellence of the Government of Mexico, such as seems rather belonging to traditions of patriarchal society, than to times in which nations vie in insubordination, with governments in intermeddling.

"Allow us to ask you as men, as husbands, as fathers, if you are prepared heedlessly to rush forward in a cause, the termination of which may involve your country of adoption in all the horrors of civil war? Are you prepared to plunge yourselves and your country into revolution, to imbrue your hands in the blood of your brethren, and finally to be expelled from the land, to which we are so much attached by the strongest of ties? If you are, then adopt the plan suggested, and we have too much reason to fear that our worst anticipations will be realized!

"But from the information which we have, and which can be relied upon with confidence, we assure you that the feelings of the Federal Government, particularly those of the President, are of the



most favorable character towards Texas. We are assured of this fact by our representative, Colonel Austin, and the advice which he most earnestly presses upon us, is to be peaceful and quiet, and to adopt as our motto, *the Constitution and Laws, State and Federal*.

“ From the State Government too, we have surely received favors the most liberal, and boons the most free ; in fact, what has been for our particular benefit, which we have asked and they have not granted, which was in their power to give? It has established the trial by jury, it has organised a court especially for Texas, and if it does not answer the desired end, and make us contented, it is not the fault of the legislature.

“ We ask you then, in the spirit of candor, has the government ever asked anything unreasonable of Texas? If she has, we must before God and our country say, *we know it not!* Again, for your experimental knowledge shall bear us out, has she ever burdened you with taxes, or the performance of arduous, expensive, or perilous duties? Nay, *has Texas ever borne any part of the expenses of sustaining the government* that protects her citizens, their lives, their liberty, and their property, either in legislation, or in war?

“ When have the people of Texas called upon the government for any law to their advantage, or for the repeal of any law by which they were aggrieved, but what their requests have been complied with? ”\*

This fidelity to oaths, this peace, this prosperity, this gratitude was, however, of short duration. Mexico disturbed it not, withdrew no protection, infringed no right; but the spirit of evil was busy and reviving. While honest men slumbered over the triumph they had achieved, the black activity of the designing broke forth again in the form of a land job! The circumstances have been described as follows by an American author : —

\* “ This address being founded on facts notorious to every man’s experience, peace and quiet were the consequence.” — *Texas and Mexico, by a Mexican Merchant*, p. 25.



“ A committee of land speculators, whose plans were well laid, and whose funds were completely organized, presented themselves before this—by the people of Texas never to be forgotten legislature,—which immediately passed a decree to sell the vacant lands of Texas, and otherwise arranged it to be done as soon as bidders should present themselves.

“ Of course they were there, and purchased this already surveyed land, of 411 leagues, for 30,000 dollars in hand, to the Government, or 72 dollars 99 cents per league. But we shall allow their travelling expenses, in conjunction *with those by-bribes* to such members of the legislature, *as were not in partnership with them*, to raise the whole amount, expended in this nefarious transaction, to 40,000 dollars, or 96 dollars 35 cents per league.

“ The house went on thus for some time gloriously ; decree after decree was passed, and signed by as corrupted a governor,—what will not gold do ! But behold the brother-in-law of the President Santana, General Don Martin Perfecto del Cos, Commandant-General of the Eastern States, and his troops were at hand ! Santana himself was close by, quelling an insurrectionary movement in Zacatecas. Orders were given from head-quarters, and the unconstitutionally acting legislature of Cohahuila and Texas were (with the exception of those who seasonably made their escape) made prisoners, and, in due time, banished ; of course, *their decrees of that session declared null and void by the general Congress of Mexico*. The Texan representatives, *and other Americans*, at that time in Monclova, lost no time in their retreat from thence to Texas—raised the war-whoop—“ Santana has destroyed the liberals of Zacatecas ; General Cos has arrested the State Congress of Cohahuila and Texas,—to arms,—*for the Mexicans have declared they will drive every AMERICAN out of their country !*”\*

This appeal was not responded to ; public scorn and condemnation pursued these vile speculators and their treasonable confederates within the walls of the legislature. The sense of the province may be gathered from the public act, of which we subjoin extracts :—

\* History of Texas. By David B. Edwards. Cincinnati, 1836.



“ Our constituents learning that the Congress of the State (Cohahuila and Texas) had, during its session of March present year, acted improperly,—contrary to the rights of State, and in direct opposition to the Constitution of the Mexican confederation,—being corrupted from their line of legislative duties by the undue influence of a few foreigners and others, they became amenable to the laws made and provided—therefore were they treated by the government of the nation according to their deserts.”

“ The law of the 14th of March past (1835,) is looked upon by the people with horror and indignation—it is looked upon as the death-blow to this rising country. In violation of the general constitution and the laws of the nation,—in violation of good faith and the most sacred guarantees,—Congress has trampled upon the rights of the people and the Government, in selling four hundred and eleven leagues at private sale, and at a shameful sacrifice; thereby creating a monopoly—thereby entirely ruining the future prospects of our country, contrary to law, and contrary to the true interest of every citizen in Texas.”

The speculators now endeavoured by desperate acts to compromise their compatriots with the native Mexicans and the government. But these sent two of their most respected citizens to General Cos to state the real feeling of the colonists and the people of Texas, and to repudiate the conduct of the rebels. Thus, then, had every means successively adopted, failed in effect, and the hitherto insignificant as desperate band, was at once utterly frustrated in its machinations and exposed in its character and intentions, and the repose of the community seemed thenceforward secured, when a new and unexpected incident occurred, and changed the face of affairs. *An armed expedition from New Orleans arrived in Texas!*

It was not against Mexican armies that these bands were directed; they were engaged in vengeful and predatory expeditions against Texans and Americans, to compel them to make common cause with themselves. They



had even the audacity to pass resolutions such as the following:—

“ *Resolved*—That no person or persons whatsoever, under the control or in the name of Santana, *shall be suffered to enter Texas, whatever may be his credentials*, or upon whatever principle he may assume the privilege.

“ *Resolved*—That if any citizen or citizens whatever, shall leave the country on, or before the contest—or shall assist the enemy in *any* shape whatsoever, during the conflict, their property shall be confiscated for and in behalf of the war.

“ *Resolved*—That the property of those inhabitants who may pretend neutrality or otherwise, so as not to assist their *brother Americans* in this war, shall be the *first* sacrificed to its welfare and prosecution.”

This was the “ *Revolution of Texas.*”

The forces of Mexico were at one time occupied in contesting, under hostile leaders, the establishment of a central or a purely federative constitution; at another engaged in preparing to receive, and finally in resisting, the attack made upon it by a great European power; so that the Government was unable to resist or put down, not the insurrection, for that term cannot apply, but the piratical seizure of the province, where the bandits were supplied and recruited from the neighbouring great nation, whose co-operation involved at once the well disposed American settlers, and added to the external and internal embarrassments of the Mexican Government, the danger of a war with the United States. However, in the early part of 1836, an effort was made; a considerable body of troops, under the President Santana, entered Texas, driving before him General Houston, with some hundred insurgents, from one frontier of the province to the other, when he was, with his vanguard of 1400, suddenly surprised by the Texans, who had been just before on the point of crossing into the United States territory. It is supposed that this surprise was owing



to reinforcements from the regular United States troops—the Texan troops being themselves Americans. The President Santana was captured with the vanguard in this bloodless surprise, and General Filisola, at the head of the main body, was deterred from attacking the insurgents from fear of compromising the life of the President; this was the *celebrated battle* of San Jacinto, on the 21st April, 1836.

Texan independence was proclaimed on the 2d March, 1836. To this document 56 names were attached; of these 50 were American citizens, three natives of Great Britain, and three natives of Mexico. These three revolted Mexicans—for the others are not only strangers and aliens, but their presence takes from the document the authority it would have, if signed only by the three Mexicans—give to themselves, by a resolution, 350,000 square miles of Mexican territory. A year elapses, and Congress, by a vote, declares them independent, according to their own terms; that is, asserts that they do possess this property.

This was the “*Independence of Texas.*”

These were the facts which European governments had to consider in coming to a decision as to the light in which they should look on the “infant state” of Texas.

In concluding this statement of the circumstances of the revolt, we have to remark, that what has been accomplished by the United States against Texas, is now enacting against California. Nor was it in Texas that the experiment was first made. The revolt of Mexico against Spain was fomented, encouraged, and supported by the United States; their sympathies were then given to Republicanism against Monarchy and Catholicism, as now their sympathy is given to Anglo-Saxon against Indo-Mexican and freedom; that is to say, lawless ambition has formed in these days, and in this region, many pretexts; but it is strange that this war of *castes, colors, and creeds*, should have been



stirred up by a people who fled from England to escape from religious persecution, and who struggled upon their own soil to assert political liberty. Thus has been prepared for the western world a fate which may make it envy, and invite from our European shores the order which a barbarous despotism shall have there established on the ruins of enlightened faction and civilized corruption.

---

#### ENGAGEMENTS OF MEXICO TO ENGLAND.

Mexico, by no single act abandoned or compromised her sovereign rights over any portion of her territory, comprised within the limits of the provincial state of Texas. As early as November, 1835, when the first overt expeditions proceeded from the shores of the United States, she indignantly remonstrated at Washington. The disregard of these remonstrances was a case of war, which the weakness of Mexico alone prevented.

A State thus assailed has to look throughout the world for allies and supporters. Where could Mexico look? With France she was at variance. Russia was supposed to have schemes upon her territory on the Pacific. Both Governments could only be considered by Mexico as associated with the United States in character and design, if not in immediate projects. There was, however, one great Government, deeply interested in her welfare—this power was England, on whom was the obligation of supporting Mexico imposed, by the fact that her own territory was exposed to the same danger as that of Mexico, and from the same source. It became, therefore, her part to support the remonstrances of Mexico, and to enforce them in case the United States disregarded the appeal.

The case presented itself in two points of view—first, the making of Texas a slave-holding state: and secondly, its



prospective incorporation with the United States. The first was repugnant to all our sympathies, as well as to our acquired rights. The second, alarming on the score of the friendly relations which it was a primary object to preserve with the United States, and threatening directly our possessions and dominions on the American continent,—and both these merged into one. Slavery being kept out of Texas, its independence would be innoxious, and might be real. Slavery established, independence was but a pretext and a passage to its incorporation. A new power springing into being between the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America, though peopled originally and entirely by citizens of the latter, could be no cause of apprehension to England : being independent it became the necessary ally of England in case she wanted one, that is, in case the United States threatened her neighbours. It would be the best protection to Mexico, as fitter to deal with their Anglo-Saxon brethren, and being by the original constitution possessed of institutions similar to those of the New England States, and not polluted by slavery, the new republic would have found support most valuable *within* the Union, and secured its permanency by arresting its aggressive and ambitious tendencies. These, however gigantic and alarming they have become, were then within reach of easy cure. But the picture is reversed, the moment that slavery is there established. It is no longer independent ; and independence is but a mask for design ; not of the United States against Mexico, but of a few plotters against the United States. The property of the one and the honour of the other were at once at stake ; the one was to be plundered to constitute the other a plunderer.

Here, then, was a danger for England as for Mexico of the most alarming kind,—a danger foreseen and self-announced from the very earliest moment. A danger which now, after nearly ten years, bursts upon the nation unpre-



pared, nothing having been done by its government, neither ignorant nor unappealed to, to prevent its occurrence, and everything to encourage the actors and to precipitate the event!

Nearly ten years ago was it furthermore avowed that the *difficulty* in the way of the annexation of Texas as a slave-holding State, lay in the necessity of *acquiring in the north a compensating and counterbalancing increase of anti-slavery territory*. By the establishment, therefore, of slavery in the provinces detached from Mexico by American adventurers, without opposition from England and with her concurrence, and, as will be hereafter seen, her positive and vehement co-operation, a change was wrought in the minds of the whole Union. By the bare possibility that England might sanction the annexation of the Texas—a wider range of ambitious prospects naturally presented itself. Not the disputed territory of the Northeast, not disputed Oregon alone, but the colonial possessions of Great Britain, from objects of hopeless longing, now became aims of settled ambition,—fostered directly in like manner by the Boundary Difference on the North, the work of the same minister.

At so early a period the Texan question commanded, upon grounds the most urgent, that the evil should be checked in its origin. The ease of doing so equalled the necessity. Here was no doubtful pretender to a Persian throne—no Asiatic complication—no Egyptian or Turkish politics. In the most thrilling accents of the English tongue was expounded the danger to Texan freedom and England's interests, by a citizen of the United States, and thousands upon thousands of our countrymen had read the exposition.

England had not to rely alone on the general rights given to her in common with every other nation by public law in arresting a danger by which she was threatened.



She had rights secured by treaty in Texas to defend—rights which she could not abstain from asserting, but which being asserted, every difficulty was solved.

The 15th article of the treaty between Great Britain and Mexico (December, 1826,) stipulated that—

“The government of Mexico engages to co-operate with his Britannic Majesty *for the total abolition of the slave trade*, and to prohibit all persons inhabiting *within the territories of Mexico*, in the most effectual manner, from taking any share in such trade.”

The revolution of Texas, supposing it *bona fide* in its origin and successful in its termination, could alter no international obligation affecting it as previously constituting a portion of Mexico. For more than three years before the recognition of its independence by any Power, the Texans violated this treaty without calling forth the necessary steps on the part of Britain to enforce her right and obtain satisfaction; yet the Texans had engaged in the traffic of slaves and imported them from the United States and direct from Africa. The opportunity thus presented itself before any one government had acknowledged the independent existence of Texas—*become a slave holding State*,—and hence before any one power could, on the ground of a *de facto* independence intermeddle in the separate proceedings of Great Britain, based on Treaty. Moreover, her zealous philanthropy in favour of the African was at that time admitted by all nations as a legitimate ground of action.

Great Britain had to call the attention of the government of Mexico to the flagrant violations of the Treaty of 1826, “by persons inhabiting the territories of Mexico.” The acknowledgment of that government that it was not within their power to control those acts, gave England a right of war against Texas, which she was free to exercise with or without Mexico’s consent. But gladly would she have availed herself of such aid in restoring order, dis-



turbed only by foreign machinations, and in freeing the loyal population of Texas from a forced participation in the rebel outbreak. What, then, easier at the outset, than prevention? Had it not been easy it was requisite. But it was easier far to do than to describe. The voice of a powerful nation in a just cause is never heard in vain; the words of a great Government are acts.

The United States at first held aloof: disclaimed all confederacy in or sanction of the proceedings in Texas, but took no measures to repress them. Years having elapsed, and public opinion gradually won over, the solicitations of her citizens, now predominant in Texas, to be received into the Union, was replied to by recognizing their *de facto* independence—we might here be reading the history of Georgia, Wallachia, or Serbia. France followed up the act of the United States, and acknowledged a sovereign existence in this body of American plunderers. The French papers, with ready instinct, exulted in the new enemy that had arisen for England in the Western world, and the natural ally that had sprung up for France. The recognition of the Texas was important in Paris because it was a *blow against* England! Her accredited representative in Texas, proposed to the Congress, to cement the alliance between them by the establishment of a line of French military colonists, as a barrier *against the Indians*. This was one of the fruits of the treaty of the 15th of July.

---

#### RECOGNITION OF TEXAS BY ENGLAND.

Having shewn what England had neglected to do, we now come to what she has done. She confirmed the act of the United States and of France—she *recognized Texas!*

No redress for past infractions of treaty are the conditions of this compact—no assurances for a future



observance of them contained in it—no single thing was required from Texas—everything was sacrificed to her.

Astounding as this may be, what we have stated is nothing to what follows. It is a compact to coerce Mexico—it is a bond of conspiracy, not a compact of mutual advantage. It is an announcement, that the independence of this revolted province is an object so dear to the British Minister, that he sacrifices to it all justice, sympathies, and interests of his nation. It is to tell Mexico, before the world, that she must desist from a contest in which she was engaged, and acknowledge the sovereignty of foreign freebooters; while aggravating the wound to the national pride, by holding Texas forth as dictating the conditions. In offering this unparalleled outrage, the British Government presented itself as a mediator!

#### TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND TEXAS.

“ *Whereas,\** her Majesty, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, being desirous of putting an end to the hostilities, which still continue to be carried on between Mexico and Texas, *has OFFERED her mediation to the contending parties,* with a view to bring about a pacification between them, and *whereas* the republic of *Texas has accepted* the mediation so offered; the republic of Texas, and her Britannic Majesty’s Government, *have determined to settle,* by means of a convention, certain arrangements which *will become necessary, IN THE EVENT of such pacification being effected,* and have, for this purpose, named as their plenipotentiaries, that is to say, the Republic of Texas, General James Hamilton, &c. &c. and her Majesty, the Queen of the United Kingdom, the Right Honourable Henry John Viscount Palmerston, &c. &c. &c. who have agreed upon, and concluded the following articles:—

“ Article 1.—The Republic of Texas agrees *that if,* by means of the mediation of her Britannic Majesty, an *unlimited truce* shall

\* See a remarkable identity of style with the Lahore compact.



be established between Mexico and Texas, WITHIN THIRTY DAYS after this convention shall have been communicated to the Mexican Government, by her Britannic Majesty's mission at Mexico, and Mexico shall have concluded a treaty of *peace* with Texas, *then and in such case* the Republic of *Texas* will take upon itself a portion, amounting to one million pounds sterling, of the capital of the foreign debt contracted by the Republic of Mexico before the 1st of January, 1835.

“Article 2.—The manner in which the capital of one million pounds sterling of foreign debt, mentioned in the preceding article, shall be transferred from the Republic of Mexico to the Republic of Texas, *shall be settled hereafter* by a special government between the Republic of Texas and the Republic of Mexico.

“Article 3.—The present convention shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at London as soon as possible within the space of nine months within this date.

“In witness whereof, &c. &c., London, 14th Nov., in the year of our Lord, A.D. 1840.

(Signed)

“PALMERSTON.

“HAMILTON.”

This treaty constituted England as much a freebooter against Mexico as the Texan insurgents. Mexico could therefore treat England only as an enemy, and if she did not do so, she shewed at least by the language she held that it was her weakness alone that prevented her.

Mexico is indebted to British subjects to the amount of thirty millions sterling; for the repayment of this debt they hold Texas bound as a part of its territory. But independently of this general engagement, they obtained, as a condition of reducing this debt to one-third, a special bond on 45,000,000 of acres of unoccupied land in the province of Texas, conceded by the law of conversion, for the deferred debt in 1837. This property fell, therefore, of right to the British bondholders, in case that Mexico failed to perform her engagements. So that any attempt of Mexico to alienate these lands, and any attempt at



usurping them by a foreign power, imposed upon England, as a matter of mere attorney practice, the necessity of interposing a bar to such misappropriation.

This claim was not unknown to the Minister who signed the convention with Texas, having been strongly urged upon him by the Committee of the South American Bondholders, and fully admitted. Nevertheless, this claim, together with the stipulation for the abolition of slavery, is put out of the way in adopting Texas, and in associating England to her violences and crimes!

The treaty, conferring these lands of Mexico on the insurgents, begins by saying that Texas is to pay one million of the foreign debt; that is, it wipes off nine of the ten millions sterling for which the land is mortgaged, and then wipes off this very million by placing to its payment, conditions that *Mexico* was to fulfil, and which of course Mexico would not fulfil.

Thus the Treaty is to wipe off at once all obligation of Texas to Mexico, and of Mexico to England. But lest Mexico should afterwards relent, and England be thus committed to the enforcing of the one million against Texas, a limit is placed in time, after the expiration of which there can be no further claim. Thirty days are given; and one day later—say the thirty-first—Mexico consenting to the “*unlimited truce*,” calls on Texas, made independent by British protection, to pay this million to the British bondholders—the British minister would step in and forbid the demand, saying, my fiat has not been executed—thirty days have elapsed!

A British minister enforces the extinction of a mortgage to British subjects in behalf of American freebooters—helps to rob Mexico and England, sustaining, at the same time, the establishment of slavery in a new region, and inviting the United States to aggression against its neighbours. Here is no matter in which men can admit doubts



with respect to conduct, and differences with respect to opinion. It is a common matter of business; it is mere police or Old Bailey fraud. If the British minister were a sharer in the plunder, it would be perhaps intelligible; if he does not pocket proceeds it is not the less fraud, and it must be far more dangerous than if it were merely a fraudulent transaction for pecuniary advantage.

All mention of the obligation of Texas having been excluded from the discussion of this subject, this clause presents England as interfering between Mexico and Texas in order *to gain*. She appears domineering\* and

\* We must here anticipate the course of events in order to connect causes and consequences, and mention that on the 15th June, 1843, this proclamation was issued by the President of Texas:—  
“An official communication has been received at the Department of State from her Britannic Majesty’s Chargé d’affaires *in Mexico*, announcing to this government the fact that the President of Mexico, would forthwith order a cessation of hostilities on his part, therefore I, Sam Houston, President of the Republic of Texas, do hereby declare and proclaim that an armistice is established, to continue during the pendency of negotiations between the two countries, and until due notice of an intention to resume hostilities (should such an intention be hereafter entertained by either party) shall have been formally announced through her Britannic Majesty’s Chargé d’affaires at the respective governments.”

So that it is the English government that is working for that cessation of hostilities, and that recognition of independence of Texas which should prepare the way for the usurpation of the United States, while the United States take this very fact of these negotiations as a ground for pushing the annexation, as an argument for it for her own people, and a justification for it in the eyes of the world. “Is not Texas,” says a member of the Senate, commenting upon this document, “already dependent upon England, when England obtains for her an armistice, and the President of Texas announces that this will continue until its termination be announced by England?”



avaricious to foreigners, at home her minister appears anxiously advancing her interests. The injured have now-a-days forgot to cry aloud, for propositions only are heeded.

Let us take, to illustrate this act, the diplomatic interference between Turkey and Greece.

The limits were there adjusted so as to include the populations which had joined in the war; the land *belonging to them* going with them in their independence. No land was included *not occupied* by the insurgents. For the public property of Turkey, which was included within these limits, compensation was made. The conferences of Poros were held to ascertain these facts, and upon its inquiries the conditions of the independence of Greece were established. In Texas the insurgents had forfeited, by the introduction of slaves, the right and title to the land that each of them had previously possessed by Mexico's grant and favour; and they proclaim their right to hundreds of millions of other acres, and England treats with them on that assumption, and constitutes herself a party to it against the rightful owner! So preposterous a case presents itself, and there is, throughout Europe, no eye to observe it—no abhorrence of the atrocity—no detection of the deception. In the whole discussions upon this subject, the insurgents' and the Mexican unoccupied lands are never doubted to be one and the same thing. A pick-pocket in the streets of London, if he knocked down a policeman, might with equal right be said to be the proprietor of the whole of Middlesex.

The intelligence of this age is not less than that of any other age, but there is the absence of the light by which things can be discerned—the light of the law and the sense of honesty. Ministers, while confused like their people, are moreover overwhelmed with multiplicity of affairs, and one Minister knows nothing of what another Minister has done. The *present* Minister of Britain would no doubt



reply to questions about Texas, as when he was for the first time questioned about Serbia—" *there are more important things to attend to.*" We have the faculty of making all things important—it is easy to do so; neglect is the secret. But there may be even worse things than neglect. Lord Aberdeen has had his feelings warmed and excited, though in opposite senses, by virtuous Serbia and profligate Texas.

Suppose, again, that in England the town of Dover had revolted, and the Government chose to grant them their independence, would that grant them also the territory of the rest of England? But the territory of Texas is no less the territory of Mexico; and if Mexico, in granting independence to the band of insurgents settled in Texas, could not grant to them more than the property they possessed, how can a foreign minister interfere, and, pretending to make treaties, in reality pass acts of confiscation?—not, indeed, avowing a purpose, but by chicane covering the crime from the nation whose power he used to perpetrate it.

And to crown this infatuation and guilt, these lands are mortgaged to the State whose minister—breaking through every decency of international intercourse—rushes into the arena to constitute it a party with Texas against Mexico, to the robbery of Mexico's land, and the extinction of its own rights.

Supposing that, by some catastrophe, France had become a silent wilderness, and that the proprietorship of that region, and sovereignty over it had fallen to England, and that she had invited settlers into France, granting them lands, upon the condition of swearing allegiance, and abstaining from traffic in slaves; and that in consequence, a few—say Barbaresques and Moors—had settled in the neighbourhood of Perpignan, bringing with them slaves in defiance of the conditions of their admission; what would be said if Algiers interfered to support their revolt against



the crown and laws of England?—interfered not only to make common cause with them, but to designate that revolt as the *Independence of “FRANCE?”* Who would not at once comprehend the motives of the Algerian Government, and recognise its character? This is what England has done, and no one can comprehend *her* motives, nor understand her character.

A reason assigned in these times for displacing the Indians from the land of their forefathers—is, that the right of occupancy, must be restricted by the *faculties of tillage*. This doctrine, put forth by an American Judge, is re-echoed at the discriminating and interesting dinner tables in England. Had the Indians robbed lands they could not till, then would their claim be valid; they would command our sympathies, and be sure of our support.

This treaty does not stand alone. There are two more treaties with Texas!\* one bearing date of the same day, the other of the day following. The one is a treaty of commerce and navigation—a treaty of commerce and navigation, *with a republic of 65,000 souls!*

The other is on the subject of slavery—it makes no mention of the obligation to exclude slavery from the soil—it passes under silence the obligation lying upon Texas to

\* These treaties have been asked for in vain of the Parliamentary Stationers, one only being forthcoming, that of Commerce and Navigation, of the 13th of November. The Annual Register is the most valuable work that we possess for the public history of England. In referring to that work upon the subject of Texas, the following passage is all that is to be found:—“On the 16th of November, a commercial treaty between Great Britain and Texas was signed. By this treaty the independence of the infant state was recognised, and the basis of the *commercial* stipulations was perfect *reciprocity*. It was hoped that this would tend to bring about a reconciliation between Mexico and Texas, and cause a settlement of the boundary between them!” Thus are the sources of history poisoned.



have no slaves, but it establishes the right of visit reciprocally by English and Texan men of war! The slaves are imported by land—this it is that gives to the Americans their peculiar interest to the settlement. Lord Palmerston makes a treaty to prevent the introduction of slaves—by sea! Such is the treaty signed by a Minister who was the vehement enemy of slavery, and who was convulsing the world in the prosecution of this darling scheme. The existence of this treaty is but an act of accusation against the Minister, as proving that the circumstance of slavery was before him, when drawing up that document. Slavery could have been tolerated by him in such circumstances only because he desired it. While this region is thrown open to the establishment of slavery, so as might be supposed to gratify the United States, the futile Right of Visit clause is thrown in. The British minister is not then sacrificing his country by collusion with the United States, it is some other interest that he serves. The object of that clause may be inferred from its effect as represented in the following statement by one of the Candidates for the Vice-Presidentship.\*

“Under this treaty the cruizers of England, and, indeed, the whole British navy, or any part of it, may be brought into the gulph of Mexico, and stationed in the narrow pass commanding the whole outlet from the gulph, and all the commerce to and from the Mississippi. To the right of search, under whatever name or form, especially within our own seas, and upon our own coasts, we never have assented, and never can assent; but here, under the pretext of searching the vessels of Texas, the navy of England, or any part of it, may occupy the only outlet of the gulph of Mexico, and all our vessels entering the

\* Mr. Walker, of Mississippi, from the New York Herald of March 7th, 1814.



gulph or returning from the mouth of the Mississippi, must pass by and under the supervision of British cruizers, subject to seizure and detention, on suspicion of being Texan vessels concerned in the slave trade. The British navy may thus also be quartered on the southern coasts of Florida, and along the coast of Cuba and Mexico, to seize upon Cuba whenever an opportunity presents. Such is the influence, which it is thus proved, by official documents, Great Britain has already obtained in Texas."

---

#### MEXICAN PROTEST.

No sooner did this plot of the British Minister transpire, than the Envoy of Mexico protested against it in fitting terms of abhorrence and indignation; and the Mexican Government, taught respect for law by the European violence to which she seemed to be exposed as a mark to level its poisoned shafts of guilt and perfidy, sanctioned the step of its representative, and supported it by a declaration distinguished alike by dignity, courage, and discrimination.

"The Government of Mexico ratifies the protest of its Charge d'Affaires to Lord Palmerston, adding, that the acknowledgment of a faction of adventurers as an independent nation, is contrary to the principles which Lord Palmerston, conjointly with the four Powers, has maintained in Europe on the Turco-Egyptian question, in which no adventurer, but an illustrious prince, a native born of the country, endeavoured to withdraw himself from the country of the Grand Seignior of Constantinople. That the conduct of Lord Palmerston was a breach of the harmony and good faith which was considered also by the Spanish American States to be characteristic of the British Government, so that it was impossible to conceive, in the face of existing treaties of alliance and friend-



ship between Great Britain and Mexico, by which the integrity of the Mexican territory is acknowledged, Texas should be recognised as a sovereign people, not a fraction of the same territory and its primitive inhabitants, but a handful of adventurers who, in the sight of all the world have entered upon the Mexican territory, is acknowledged, *bringing slaves with them to re-establish slavery in a country in which by law slavery was abolished.* That in the treaty between Lord Palmerston and the Agent for Texas, there is *no provision for the abolition of slavery, a condition which the English Government has exacted from all the Spanish American Governments.* That the territory of Texas is mortgaged for the foreign debt of Mexico, and to permit the alienation of a property so sacred AGAINST THE WILL OF ITS OWNER, and encouraging the desires of its aggressors with the moral force of the recognition of their independence, is to attack every principle of justice and international right.

“In consequence, the Mexican government, firm in the justice of its cause, and resolved to preserve the integrity of its territory, will commit to force the execution of the national will, whose energy is daily displayed in the resources voluntarily proffered by all the citizens, and in the progressive amelioration of the revenues of the state. And the English people will render justice to Mexico *when it is seen that the anomalous conduct of the British Minister does not prevent her from fulfilling the obligations which she has contracted,* and will see besides that the Mexican nation knows how to distinguish *between the British people and their Government.*”

The excuse set up for the minister's acts, that is, for the speaker's heedlessness, will be—“Oh, he had other business to attend to; he could not have been aware of the circumstances; he left it to some clerk in the Foreign Office. You cannot expect a British Minister to



attend to such paltry things as these." Now this defence of ignorance cannot be set up here; there stands the Mexican Protest, which is the *whole case*. The Mexican Minister must have urged all these reasons before—nevertheless, there stands the Treaty. It has borne its fruits; Slavery is established and British debt wiped out; Texas Annexation is decided by two of the "three estates" of the Union; war between the United States and Mexico approaches, and there is the Protest—it was made public by the Mexican Government,—*there is no reply!*

We cannot, need not stay for further comment. What parallel is to be found for such acts in the records of human crime? and we know not if in the catalogue of the deeds of the minister by which it has been perpetrated that it can be matched in composure and audacity!

---

#### RECOGNITION BY GREAT BRITAIN OF THE REVOLTED AMERICAN COLONIES OF SPAIN.

In order that the conduct of the British Government on the present occasion may be justly appreciated, it is requisite to revert to her former acts, in somewhat similar circumstances, when our councils were directed by men of undoubted genius, and of recognised authority in matters of international law and practice, and under whom served both the Foreign Ministers that have conducted the recent transactions with Texas.

The enormous possessions of Spain in the Western Hemisphere, were not held as England now holds North America or India. She watched them with the most jealous eye, she most sedulously excluded them from intercourse with other countries, nor was it enough to deal with her own territories in a manner which should take from other nations, all interest for her sovereignty, and



inspire them with sympathy for rebellion against it. Her restrictive system was directed offensively and injuriously against Great Britain, interrupting her trade and navigation with her own Colonies. Thence had arisen deep animosity between the two nations. Under such circumstances it was to be expected, that the insurrection of the Spanish Colonies would have been hailed in England with delight; that seeing therein the gratification of treasured up bitterness—the opening of new fields to commerce, united to that great attraction of modern Europe, the breaking up of empires and the overthrow of states and laws—we should have rushed headlong to their support, poured forth as England has done in Greece, blood and treasure, or prepared cheap profits by encouragement and protection, as the United States in Texas. So it would have been, had the event occurred to day, but thirty-five years ago it was a different England, little as her present inhabitants may suspect or can conceive the change. England restrained her feelings, was not seduced by her interests, took not her opinion as the rule of her conduct, and observing the law, she granted to the insurgents, neither avowed support nor secret encouragement. Yet at the moment of the outbreak of these insurrections, the shield of England's protection was extended over Spain, and she might have made with her, her own terms. But she proposed nothing regarding the American Colonies, she uttered no word that could wound the honour or pride of Spain, or awaken suspicions respecting the motives of England.

In 1810, the mediation of England to effect a reconciliation with her Colonies, was requested by Spain and granted to her, but she subsequently changed her mind. On this occasion *permission was asked and granted*, to trade with these Colonies, and the ancient interdiction of



trade and coast laws of Spain, were, as regarded them, "considered tacitly repealed."

In 1812 circumstances appearing more favourable, England offered her mediation to the Cortes. The independence of the Colonies, was not assumed as the condition of that mediation. Our mediation was refused and it was not pressed.

In the Treaty of 1814 with Spain, the British Government introduced the expression of "an earnest wish to see the restoration of the Spanish authority in America," and bound itself to prohibit British subjects from supplying the revolted Colonies with munitions of war. This engagement was fulfilled by an order in Council.

In 1815, Spain applied to England for her good offices, in effecting an adjustment with her Colonies, but as she refused to state the terms upon which she was willing to negotiate, England refused to yield her mediation.\*

In 1819, an Act of Parliament was passed to prohibit British subjects from serving in the ranks of the revolted Colonists.

In 1822 upon a representation on the part of Spain, that she was about to take measures for the reduction of the Colonists, Great Britain urged for the first time upon

\* Mr. Canning thus states the case in a despatch to Sir William A'Court, January 30th, 1824. "From the year 1810 to the year 1818, when the recognition was proposed to be undertaken by the Allied Powers assembled in conference at Aix-la-Chapelle, and from 1818 to the present time, the good offices of His Majesty have been at the service of Spain, within limitations, and upon conditions which have been in each instance explicitly described. Those limitations have uniformly excluded the employment of force or menace against the Colonies on the part of any mediating power, and have uniformly required the previous statement by Spain of some definite and intelligible proposition."



the Spanish Government, the necessity of putting an end to this state of hopeless war, and announced the necessity in which she would be herself of negotiating with these *de facto* independent States. It is indeed at once a cheering and a melancholy contrast, that is here presented with the doctrines of the instructed, and the conduct of the rulers of our present time. Cheering that we have so recently conducted ourselves like an honest and a rational nation; melancholy to think that we have so rapidly sunk into heedlessness and misconduct, no less irrational than immoral.

While England interfered not herself, of course she prevented interference by others.

On the invasion of Spain by France in 1823, the assent of the British Government was yielded under the express condition that France should not interfere between Spain and her Colonies.

It was not till fourteen years after the first appeal for mediation had been made; it was not till after the powerlessness of Spain to regain her ascendancy had been proved and confirmed; it was not till after the growth of extensive commercial relations with the colonies, sanctioned by Spain, had imposed the necessity of international relations with them, that England took the first step of a formal and diplomatic kind,—that was simply the appointing of consular agents.

In the Royal speech at the opening of the Session of 1824, it was announced that in respect to Spain:—

“His Majesty has appointed Consuls to preside at the principal ports and places of those provinces (which have declared their separation from Spain) for the protection of the trade of her subjects. As to any further measures his Majesty has preserved to himself an *unfettered discretion*, to be exercised as the circumstances of those countries, and the interests of his own people, may appear to his Majesty to require.”



Mr. Canning, commenting upon this passage, says :—

“The interpretation of this passage is clear—all know the meaning of it to be that his Majesty declined overtures for any joint consideration of this subject.”

Alas ! that Mr. Canning had not applied to the East the doctrines he so prided himself in revering in the West. Here was the twilight. We simultaneously exulted in *unfettered action* in one country, and announced as commendable, *concert* with Foreign Powers in another !

The sense of the Government at that time in respect to the right of nations, and the rule of conduct which they applied in the present case, was, on the 4th March of the same year, expressed by Lord Liverpool as follows :—

“A *formal* acknowledgment of independence could *properly* be made *only* by the power who *claimed* dominion over another, and in the *strict sense of the word* we had *no right* either to acknowledge or dispute their independence.”

Here appears the declaration distinct in itself, that no nation could interfere between states, or portions of states at war, and that no value could attach to recognition of independence, and also, that such recognition, if extending beyond the admission of the fact, was itself criminal ; but in the guarded fashion in which the law is laid down, in the clogs and qualifications appended, appears the mean subserviency to the opinion of these times, that boded, and has brought the lawlessness of the present.

So far the British Government had proceeded only to the establishment of consular agents ; but there was a growing desire throughout the nation, and an earnest appeal from the mercantile interests for a formal recognition of South American independence, whilst attempts were made by the great Powers of Europe and of America to convert this question into one of conjoint decision and of interposition of foreign States in the affairs of their neighbours. The English Government resisted alike the desires of its



people, and the instances of foreign Governments—it did what it considered proper to do, and did so alone, boldly as justly resisting the attempt of diplomatic intervention.

On the 15th June, Sir James Mackintosh brought forward this question, presenting a petition from 113 commercial houses in London; on which occasion Mr. Canning replied to the following effect:—

“The Government of Great Britain thought it not merely politically expedient, but just and generous to afford to Spain the opportunity of presidency (of negotiation with the Colonies) and absolutely to suspend any decision until they knew in what degree she would avail herself of that opportunity. That condition is now at an end. The British Government is left to act without further reference to Spain—such is the result I have to communicate, and here the only communication I have to make to the house ends.”

He sat down amidst cheers from all parts of the House, and immediately rose again to say—

“He had to communicate a fact which he had overlooked, and the statement of which might be acceptable. That fact was, *that a second application had been made to the Government of His Britannic Majesty to become parties to the conference about to assemble* (by the Powers of Europe for the settlement of the affairs of South America) *which application, though pressed with urgent entreaties, had been again steadfastly refused!*”

This information was received with reiterated applause.

At this time there were two great insurrectionary movements going on in opposite regions of the earth, in Greece against Turkey, and in America against Spain. On the outbreak of the Greek revolution, Russia,—having denounced it as revolutionary,—offered and pressed upon Turkey her military co-operation to put it down. The proposals for intervention in respect to America, were made by the Spanish Government itself, in the first instance, to France; and by France it was urged on the other Powers.



At this time France had just completed the intervention in Spain itself, at the suggestion of Russia, and was governed by an administration raised to office,—as now known on indubitable testimony, that of the minister himself,—by the intrigues of Russia, and under the acknowledged influence of that Power. Russia may therefore be looked upon as the proposer of both interventions, the ostensible object of which was the subjugation of the revolutionary principle by reducing the revolted provinces. The two mother countries taking opposite courses: Spain invoking co-operation, and Turkey protesting\* against any interference between herself and her subjects, and appealing to the rights of nature and nations, the practices of civilized communities and the faith of treaties.

England took opposite courses in these questions. In respect to the first, she associated herself with Russia to enforce *by arms* the emancipation of Greece, while she resisted, and thereby prevented, any intervention in the affairs of Spain in South America. In a memorandum of a conference between Prince Polignac and Mr. Canning,

\* The Greeks equally protested against Russian interference, and first addressed themselves to England rather for protection against Russia than Turkey. M. Rodios writes to Mr. Canning, August 12, 1824:—

“The Government (of Greece) would have persevered in its system of silence, had not a note proceeding from the north of Europe *obliged it to break this silence*. This note decides on the fate of Greece by a will that is foreign to it. The Greek nation prefer a glorious death to the disgraceful lot intended to be imposed on them.”

To this Mr. Canning replies:—

“*The opinion of the British Government is, that any plan proceeding from the Cabinet of St. Petersburg can be drawn up only with friendly intentions towards Greece.*”



on the 9th Oct. 1823, the views and decision of the British Government are thus stated by the latter:—

“That the junction of any foreign power, in an enterprise of Spain against the colonies, would be viewed by them as constituting an entirely new question ; and one upon which they must take such decision as the interests of Great Britain might require.

“That the British Government absolutely disclaimed, not only any desire of appropriating to itself any portion of the Spanish colonies, but any intention of forming any political connexion with them, beyond that of amity and commercial intercourse.

“That in those respects, so far from seeking an exclusive preference for British subjects over those of foreign states, England was prepared, and would be contented, to see the mother country (by virtue of an amicable arrangement) in possession of that preference ; and to be ranked, after her, equally with others, on the footing of the most favoured nation.”

In the same conference the questions of consular agents is thus disposed of by Mr. Canning:—

“That the mission of consuls to the several provinces of Spanish America was no new measure on the part of this country : that it was one which had, on the contrary, been delayed, perhaps too long, in consideration of the state of Spain, after having been announced to the Spanish Government in the month of December last, as settled ; and even after a list had been furnished to that Government of the places to which such appointments were intended to be made.

“That such appointments were absolutely necessary for the protection of British trade in those countries.”

Three months later the British Government made another attempt to induce Spain to profit by the opportunity afforded her, of acquiring advantages in South America, by being the first to recognize colonies she could no longer hope to reconquer. Mr. Canning (January 30th, 1824) expressed himself in these terms:—

“Should Spain resolve to avail herself of the opportunity yet



within her power, the British Government would, if the Court of Madrid desired it, willingly afford its countenance and aid to a recognition, commenced on that only basis which appears to them to be now practicable, and would see, without reluctance, the conclusion, through a negotiation on that basis, of an arrangement by which the mother country should be secured in the enjoyment of commercial advantages superior to those conceded to other nations.

“For herself, Great Britain asks no exclusive privileges of trade, no insidious preference, but equal freedom of commerce for all. If Spain should determine to persevere in the present counsels, it cannot but be expected that Great Britain must take her own course upon this matter, when the time for taking it shall arrive, of which Spain shall have full and early intimation.”

In the same despatch the English Government declares in express terms its determination to take part *with* the Colonies in the event of any attempt of mediation, and of Congress, upon the conditions assumed of interference, either by “*force or menace* ;” and we learn that the Powers, who so proposed to interfere, were Austria, Russia, Prussia, Portugal, the Netherlands, and the United States.

Lord Brougham, on the 3d Feb. 1824, said :—“Ferdinand had been expressly assured by the Emperor Alexander, that upon the destruction of the constitutional system he would assist him to recover his Transatlantic dominions,” and he prognosticates as the result, “that these countries would be again brought under the iron rule of the mother-country,” and on these grounds he “applauded the course taken by the United States,”—who were acting in concert with this same Emperor Alexander,—“*and hoped that England would follow in the same path.*” But fortunately, those who then ruled England neither sought the help of Henry Brougham, nor were scared by his thunder.

It has been seen that the object of England was to allow to Spain priority of negotiation, and therefore preference in treaties with her late colonies. The object of



the United States, as exposed in the Message to Congress of 1825, was exactly the reverse. It is laid down as a fundamental maxim to prevent such concessions as “indispensable to the effectual *emancipation* of the *American hemisphere*,” and it is enforced upon the South American States “that such concession to any European nation would be incompatible with that independence which they have declared and maintained,” and on this the President grounds the mission of representatives from the United States to the Congress at Panama.

Mr. Quincy Adams, in a subsequent Message (1826,) deplores the death of the Emperor Alexander, as a great misfortune for the United States. He speaks of the “*candid and confidential intercourse* of sentiment between him and the Government of the United States, upon the AFFAIRS OF SOUTHERN AMERICA ;” and he points out “the necessity in which the other Governments of Europe were *thereby* placed, of sooner or later recognising the independence of our neighbours.”

Here then is seen, entirely from another source, the agency of Russia in the questions at issue between Spain and her Colonies. While moving at once the diplomacy of Europe and the diplomacy of America, she was using them in opposite senses. Employing in Europe the principle of legitimacy, to induce them to form a congress, to restore by force and threat, the supremacy of the Crown of Spain,—employing in America the revolutionary tendencies and sympathies of the United States, to lead them to a concert to extort the independence of the Colonies from the Crown of Spain !

The American President goes on to shew that the policy of Russia is not contingent upon the accidental biasses of a chief, and that, as amongst us, the King does not die, so in Russia policy does not change.

“ We have had the most satisfactory assurance that the sen-



timents of the reigning Emperor towards the United States, are altogether conformable to those which have so long and constantly animated his Imperial Brother, and we have reason to hope that they will serve to cement that harmony and good understanding between the two nations, which, founded in *congenial interests*, cannot but result in advancement of the welfare and prosperity of both."

Mr. Canning was, however, able and fortunate enough to paralyse these projects, or at least to postpone their execution for a time. He prevented European conferences to decide upon the affairs of America, and caused to drop from the hands of Russia the half forged additional chains which she was about to place upon the necks of European Cabinets, and dissolved the power of the attractions with which she was drawing to herself the desires and the policy of the United States. Preserving the faith of England to law, and its obligations to Spain, he preserved also his duties to British interests, and to the American Colonies, and prevented the accumulation of incalculable confusion and distraction upon Europe and America. It was with a full sense of the difficulties with which he had to contend, and of the triumph that he had effected over them, that those memorable words of his were uttered, though intelligible only in the knowledge of those difficulties, "that he had called a new world into existence *to redress the balance of the old.*"

At the opening of the Session of 1825, the following announcement was made from the throne by the Commissioners appointed to open Parliament:—

"In conformity with the declarations which have been repeatedly made by his Majesty, his Majesty has taken measures for confirming by treaties the commercial relations already subsisting between this kingdom and *those countries* of America, which *appear* to have *established* their separation from Spain."

Such was the simplicity of this most grave announce-



ment, such the care even at this last moment, to fulfil the conditions imposed upon the Government of this country, as laid down by Lord Liverpool, as interfering in no way between countries, one of whom claimed dominion over the other, and of invalidating by no act the *de jure* rights of Spain.

The discussion which took place upon the Address was memorable as being one of the happiest oratorical efforts of Mr. Canning.\* The point at issue reduced itself indeed to the simple one of the time and mode of execution. The opposition did not question the recognition of the provinces—it had been previously urging to that recognition. The Government now justified the time it had chosen, and the mode it had adopted, and concurring with the opposition upon all other points, it peculiarly upon these entered its claim to merit and applause.

“As to the propriety,” says Mr. Canning, “of admitting the independence of States that had successfully shaken off their dependence on the mother country, to the rights of nations, there can be no dispute. There were two ways of proceeding, where the case was made questionable—recklessly and with a hurried course, or by another so strictly guarded, that no principle should be violated, and no offence should be given. The three States with which the British Government had to deal were Buenos Ayres, Colombia, and Mexico, and at no earlier period could any of them have been recognized.”

“As to Buenos Ayres, it was undoubtedly true that the Spanish forces were sent away many years since; but it comprised thirteen or fourteen small and separate states, which were not till very lately collected into any federal union. Would it not have been an absurdity to have treated with a power which was incapable of answering for the conduct of the communities of which it was composed? So soon as it was known that a consolidation had taken

\* It was on this occasion that he quoted and applied the words, “*this is my thunder.*”



place, the treaty with Buenos Ayres was signed. Next, as to Colombia. As late as 1822 the last of the Spanish forces were sent away from Porto Cabello, which was up till that time held for the King of Spain. It was only since that time that Colombia would have been admitted as a state having a separate existence. Some time after that, however, Colombia chose to risk her whole force, and a great part of her treasure, in a distant war with Spain in Peru. Had that enterprise proved disastrous, the expedition would have returned with the troops to re-establish the royal authority. The danger was now at an end. The case of Mexico was still more striking. Not nine months ago, an adventurer who had wielded the sceptre of Mexico, left these shores to return thither, and re possess his abdicated throne. Was that a moment at which this country ought to have interfered to decide, by recognition, the government of Mexico? The failure of the attempt of that adventurer afforded the opportunity for recognition; and, the instant the failure was known, the decision of the British Cabinet was taken. Therefore, so far from the time being ill-chosen, or the measures tardily adopted, it was not physically or morally possible to have anticipated them even by a few weeks."

Coming then to deal with the mode of recognition, and the objections respecting it, Mr. Canning says—

"Was this mode of proceeding unsatisfactory, because there did not exist in the archives of the Foreign Office, a single document relative to this question, which Spain had not seen, and of which the powers in alliance with this country had not been supplied with copies? Was this transaction deemed unsatisfactory, because Spain was told, that if she would take precedence in recognising the independence of the Colonies, this country would be content to follow her steps, and to allow to her a priority in the markets of those Colonies? Was the arrangement unsatisfactory, because proceeding alone, England disdained to take any unfair advantages of a friendly State? Was it unsatisfactory, because we saw, that whoever might follow us in recognising the independence of those States, would be placed by our side, and would enjoy equal advantages with ourselves."



In the treaty proposed by Great Britain to Mexico, there was the clause of the most favoured nation, but that clause was restricted, allowing under certain restrictions, preferences to be given to Spain and to the South American States. Moreover, there was no article containing a recognition of the independence of Mexico. The Committee of the Mexican Congress, to which it was referred, urged the Congress to reject it, and the Congress itself expressed the wish that it should contain "an express recognition of independence." This the British Government would not admit.

In the very same message in which is announced the ratification of the treaty with Great Britain, is also announced by the President to the Mexican Republic, that "the frontier on the west and the north has been fortified with *particular care to the side of the Texas*." This was a period of great financial embarrassments, and this was one of the first applications made by Mexico of the sums borrowed from England.

The proposed Congress of Panama was to be assembled, not merely for the purpose of maintaining the conjoint independence of the South American States against "*the common enemy*" (Spain); but also for the purpose of adjusting common principles of international law and internal practice, to bring about "good harmony amongst themselves, and free them from all European influence or domination," and further to extend that harmony "throughout the world." In these propositions we may find the interpretation of the "candid and confidential communication" between the United States and the Russian Government, respecting "the affairs of Southern America."

"The general Congress which the South American Republics proposed to hold at Panama held out to the United States," says the Annual Register, "an opportunity of forming with themselves a connection exclusive of all European influence, which would make North America, in some measure, a member of their own body, and



secure to it preferences and a preponderance to which European powers, who took no part in the deliberations of the assembled representatives, could not hope to aspire."

The Union would rather have made the Southern States dependencies of the Northern, and that not by the exclusion of "all European influence," but through a European influence, and one equally interested in gaining an ascendancy over the United States, and in convulsing the Southern Republics, if only to prevent their produce from coming into competition with her own. With strange inconsistency, the same authority which argues that the United States sought to exclude European influence, represents Russia as supporting their views "warmly at Madrid."

At the very moment that these philanthropic objects were put forward by the United States, they were making the same insidious preparation for breaking down the authority of Mexico that they had so recently been applying to Spain.

In 1825 the fortification of the Texas frontier had been provided for. How necessary the precaution appeared in the subsequent year, when a revolt broke out in the Texas. The insurgents on the 16th December, 1826, declared their independence, assumed the title of the Republic of Fredonia, and entered into treaties of alliance with the neighbouring Indian tribes. "This event was believed to have taken place, if not at the instigation yet with the knowledge and connivance of the United States. The Mexican Congress appropriated £500,000. for the expedition for the repression of the insurrection; but the rebellion was put down without assistance from Mexico, by the troops in the country and its inhabitants; the dispersed insurgents took refuge amongst the Indians and in the territory of the United States."\* This is the interpretation of those principles of general harmony and benevolence which Russia assisted the United States to urge at Madrid, and which the United States, through the Congress of Panama and subsequently

\* Annual Register, 1827.



of Tacubaya, endeavoured to establish throughout the "American Continent," and which were thence to be extended "throughout the world!"

At the close of the year 1827, the President says: "Since the accession of the Emperor Nicholas to the Imperial throne of all the Russias, the friendly dispositions towards the United States, so constantly maintained by his predecessor, continue unabated, and have recently been testified by the appointment of a Minister Plenipotentiary to reside at this place." Thus then had the harmony endured throughout, full and complete at its close as promising at its commencement.

At the opening of the Drama, the parts are distributed as they now appear at the close of the first act. The United States preying on the Southern Republics and secretly prompted by Russia, while France stands hanging between, urged and used by both. There is this difference, however, that England is changed from protector to betrayer.

It seems impossible to imagine that the same nation, and within the same generation, should present examples of characters so opposite, and of conduct so contradictory. Her conduct in the first instance was not the result of caprice, but in obedience to the laws; in the second, our acts are in rebellion against those very laws, in opposition to interests the most clear, in sacrifice of the most distinctly established rights, and in defiance of the most strongly pronounced opinions and sympathies.

We conclude this reference to our past conduct in respect to the Spanish Colonies, by repeating what we have already noticed, that in the treaties ratified in 1826, between England and the former Colonies of Spain, the condition was established, that slavery should be extirpated from their soil. In taking part with the American freebooters that have robbed Texas, we have supported them against the mother state and our *Treaties in the establishment of slavery!*



CONDUCT OF ENGLAND TOWARDS TEXAS AND MEXICO,  
UNDER THE NEW ADMINISTRATION.

The administration to whom pertained the Foreign Minister whose acts in Texas we have described, was driven from office in 1841. On the accession of their opponents, a reversion of a course so criminal and incomprehensible as that pursued in Texas, and in regard to Mexico and the United States—might have been considered, not as a consequence only, but as of necessity, involved in the change which England had effected in her governors. But nothing of what was rational,—nothing of what was expected,—nothing of what was requisite was done. Nor was it cold indifference alone that was manifested by the new chiefs of England to a position of such imbecile infamy; but their apathy was coloured with the show of approval—they sent a Consul-General to Texas. They choose for that officer one selected by their predecessor for buccaneering expeditions in the other hemisphere, and marked thus at once by this eloquent selection their adoption of the policy of their predecessor, and their sympathy with the pursuits and character of Texas.

Definite language or specific act in reference to Texas, we have not from Lord Aberdeen, until two years and some days after his appointment to the office of disposer of Great Britain;—it is then no act of his—it is in reply to empty words uttered in the House of Lords.

Lord Brougham was, on the 18th August, 1843, “*irresistibly anxious*\* for the abolition of slavery in Texas,” and “*knew* the Texans would do *much* as regarded the abolition of slavery, if Mexico *could be induced* to recognize their independence,” and “if by our good offices *we could get* the Mexican government to acknowledge the independence of

\* It is a pity that this anxiety did not lead him to read the treaties, and then to consult some work on international law.



Texas, *it MIGHT terminate* in the abolition of slavery in Texas, and *ultimately the whole of the Southern States in America.*"

Lord Aberdeen, thereupon, said that he was endeavouring "*to procure from Mexico the recognition of Texas,*" and that he "need hardly say that *every effort* on the part of Her Majesty's Government would lead *to that result which was contemplated* by his noble friend; that no one was more anxious than himself to see the abolition of slavery in Texas," which would be "pressed" by "*negotiations* and every other means in the power of Government."

Supposing that Lord Aberdeen had meant what he said, and that with the power of England at his disposal, he had intended to interfere in the affairs of a foreign state, to change its internal constitution, then would this have been an announcement to the United States of a danger of the greatest magnitude, and the revelation on the part of Great Britain of a conspiracy of the blackest die, giving to the United States the power of appealing to every civilized community for support and assistance in the war for existence into which it was impelled. But the words of Lord Aberdeen were simply breath, mere gossip, and every man in both hemispheres knew that they were so; and he concludes with excusing himself from expressing any opinion on the subject; in fact, he was not aware that he had said any thing. Nevertheless this conversation has been made the foundation of the subsequent proceedings of the United States, and not without reason, as the very insignificance of the words uttered made them to the United States of the deepest importance.

Mr. Everett, on Nov. 3rd, 1843, writes:—

"In obedience to your instructions, I alluded to the *agency which the British government were supposed to be exercising to procure the abolition of slavery in Texas.* Lord Aberdeen said he was glad I had mentioned this subject, for it was *one on which*



*he intended himself to make some observations. His attention had been called to some suggestions in the American papers in favour of the annexation of Texas to the Union, by way of counteracting the designs imputed to England; and he would say, that if this measure WERE UNDERTAKEN ON ANY SUCH GROUNDS, it would be wholly without provocation."*

To say that if undertaken *on such grounds* it would be without provocation, is to concede to the United States the right to take this step if one pleased.

Mr. Everett reporting, Lord Aberdeen proceeds:—

*"England had acknowledged the independence of Texas, and had treated and would continue to treat her as an independent power. That England had long been pledged to encourage the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery, as far as her influence extended, and in every proper way, but had no wish to interfere in the internal concerns of foreign governments. She gave her advice where she thought it would be acceptable in favour of the abolition of slavery, but nothing more. In reference to Texas, the suggestion that England had made or intended to make the abolition of slavery the condition of any treaty arrangement with her, was wholly without foundation. It had never been alluded to in that connection."*

Lord Aberdeen repels as an injurious imputation, that which it was his duty to have enforced. It was a right which he ought to have obtained for England, had it not been already secured to her by Canning.

We continue to quote Lord Aberdeen. What he can utter is truly wonderful.

*"General Hamilton, as commissioner from Texas, had proposed that England should make or guarantee a loan to Texas, to be used to aid her in obtaining from Mexico the recognition of her independence, and in other ways to promote the development of her resources; and he himself (Lord Aberdeen) had at first thought somewhat favourably of the proposition, considering Texas as a fine promising country, which it would be good policy to help through her temporary embarrassments. But on mentioning the project to*



his colleagues, they deemed it wholly inexpedient, nor did he himself continue to give it countenance; nor was the loan, as proposed by General Hamilton, and at first favourably viewed by himself, *in the slightest degree connected with the abolition of slavery as a condition or consequence*. In the course of the last summer he had been waited upon, as he supposed I was aware at the time, by a deputation of American abolitionists, who were desirous of engaging the British government in some such measure, (viz., of a loan connected with the abolition of slavery), but that he had given them no countenance whatever. He had informed them that, by *every proper means of influence he would encourage the abolition of slavery, and that he had* RECOMMENDED THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT TO INTEREST ITSELF IN THE MATTER; but he told them at the outset that he should consider himself bound in good faith to repeat every thing that might pass between them to the *Texan Chargé d'affaires*."

By England's treaty with Mexico in 1826, the federative states of that republic bound the territories appertaining to them, to a total abolition of slavery. That obligation is inherent to the soil. Texas could not, by separating from the United States of Mexico, free herself from it, even though that *de facto* independence claimed for her should have been secured *de jure* by an unconditional recognition of Mexico. England had not caused the insertion of a special clause reiterative of this obligation, but she had inserted no clause discharging either England or Texas from their mutual obligations; she required to exercise *no agency*\*

\* What the agency was that England employed in Texas to promote her views, the American agents sufficiently represent, in describing the hoax played off on Lord Aberdeen about the loan; beyond this there was the agent sent by *Lord Durham from Canada to Texas*, to preach war against Mexico, extol slavery, and proclaim the "acquisitive instincts" of the Anglo Saxon race; and this was the aspirant to place in Texas, the confidentially consulted of the Foreign Office, and the sole instructor of, and authority to the British nation on Texan politics.



to procure abolition of slavery in any portion of the then existing Mexican territory. She had kept silent on the past infraction, awaiting the termination of this contest, but this proceeding of the representative of the United States, required, if any thing could require, that an end be put to suspense, and the right of England asserted. Had such—the statement of the case—been the British minister's reply, the matter was at once closed; but had such reply been possible, the case would not have arisen. Lord Aberdeen was estimated from the hour of his entrance into office, or long before. The interview was a gossiping forth of *opinion* on his part, warily drawn forth and recorded by the crafty American, and then sent back to Lord Aberdeen to confirm.

But, as if this had not sufficiently compromised England, Lord Aberdeen recapitulates all his untutored anxiety in a despatch to Mr. Pakenham, for communication to the United States' Secretary of State; in which he says, that Her Majesty's Government “have put themselves forward “in pressing the Government of Mexico to acknowledge “Texas as independent,” and that with regard thereto, they “*avow that they wish to see slavery abolished there, as elsewhere, and they should rejoice if the recognition of that “country by the Mexican Government should be accompanied “BY AN ENGAGEMENT on the part of Texas to abolish slavery “eventually, and, under proper conditions, throughout the “republic.”*

Puerile as all this is, the heart sinks as it dwells on the solemnity of the transactions, the magnitude of the interests thus bartered away in vain sounds; words without substance or application, taking the place of language consistent with a position of undoubted right and acknowledged power. The words of Lord Aberdeen amount to an avowal of a desire to make Mexico impose that condition of things on Texas which is the object of the fears of the United States. Fearful of an act of energy made in the behalf and in the



name of England, that of Mexico is put forward; to her it is left to do that which the act of England disqualifies her from performing. This cowardly purpose is perceptible amid useless sentences, uncalled-for observations, and general propositions, all of which serve him nothing and are turned against him. His declarations of integrity, his propitiations of favour serve him not, his empty propositions are returned upon him, to overwhelm him. Lord Aberdeen's communication is reported on the 3d of November, 1843, it is not answered till the 13th of April, 1844. The honest man has deemed his favour ripening,—and lo his words have brought forth the Annexation Treaty! The day after it is signed the American Government deign to reply by communicating the treaty in a despatch the most insulting that ever was addressed by overbearing despot to cringing slave.

Mr. Calhoun\* says that he is directed by the President of the United States to express the—

*“deep concern excited by the avowal for the first time made to this government, ‘that Great Britain desires, and is constantly exerting herself to procure, the general abolition of slavery throughout the world.’”*

*“It is with still deeper concern the President regards the avowal of Lord Aberdeen, of the desire of Great Britain to see slavery abolished in Texas; and, as he infers, is endeavouring, through her diplomacy, to accomplish it, by making the abolition of slavery ONE OF THE CONDITIONS ON WHICH MEXICO SHOULD acknowledge her independence. It has confirmed his previous impressions as to the policy of Great Britain in reference to Texas, and made it his*

\* In this despatch there is the unblushing avowal that the Texan insurgents were *American citizens*. He says, “It was the Spanish Government and Mexico herself that invited and offered *high premiums* to our citizens to colonize Texas.” There have been before now men treacherous and ungrateful, but they have never before made parade of their ingratitude, nor urged it as giving them a right to punish or destroy their benefactor.



duty to examine with much care and solicitude what *would be its effects on the prosperity and safety of the United States should she succeed in her endeavours.* \* \* \* Under this conviction it is felt to be *the imperious duty of the federal government, the common representative and protector of the States of the Union, to adopt, in self-defence, the most effectual measures to defeat it.*"

"Texas would expose the weakest and most vulnerable portion of our frontier to inroads, and *place in the power of Great Britain the most efficient means of effecting in the neighbouring States of this Union what she avows to be her desire to do in all countries where slavery exists.*"

"The President DIRECTS ME TO INFORM YOU *that a treaty HAS BEEN CONCLUDED between the United States and Texas FOR THE ANNEXATION of the latter to the former AS A PART OF ITS TERRITORY, which will be submitted without delay to the Senate for its approval.* This step has been taken as THE MOST EFFECTUAL, if not *the only means of guarding against the THREATENED DANGER and securing their permanent peace and welfare.*"

England had to act, she fails to do so, but gives words, and words of no avail, destructive of her power and nonsensical. On the other hand, the United States, thus strengthened, encouraged and armed, acts, and the act is as bold as it is flagrant and decisive.

---

#### TREATY BETWEEN TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES.

Article 1. Cedes to the United States all its territories, to be held by the United States in full property and sovereignty. It is a cession of territories to be held as such; there is no mention of *state* or *annexation*.

2. The *citizens* of Texas are *incorporated* in the Union.

3. Titles and claims to real estate recognized.

4. Public lands to be regulated as other public lands of the Union.

5. The United States assume the debts and liabilities of Texas. No mention of foreign debt, or of liability for



Mexican debt. THE DEBT SO ASSUMED, SHALL NOT EXCEED 10,000,000 dollars.

5. Settles a Commission for the liquidation of the debts.

6. Texan laws to be maintained, and officers retained, until new provision, *excepting* the President, Vice-President, and heads of Departments.

7. Commissioner of the United States to receive the transfer of territory, archives, and public property; "AND HE SHALL EXERCISE ALL EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY IN SUCH TERRITORY."

This treaty is thus not of Annexation, but of Surrender; it is not a state annexed, but a province acquired. The Federal Government takes possession of the public property, archives, &c. and sends a Commission to administer the internal laws—its present Government being disposed of by simply *excepting* "President, Vice-President, and heads of departments," in the article stipulating the conditional continuance in their functions of the inferior officers.

Texas is to be incorporated without a voice in Congress, so that the objection of the New England States on the score of slavery is removed, and Texan equality *adjourned* until compensation can be had on the north.

Texas is brought under the international stipulations existing between the United States and Foreign Powers, to the abrogation of its own.

Its laws are confirmed, so slavery is established.

No foreign debt is provided for, and a stipulation, limiting the amount of its debts, excludes foreign debt and liabilities.

The United States is to liquidate internal debts, and appropriates for that purpose a sum greatly exceeding the debts, as presented in the Texan documents.

But there are treaty stipulations existing between England and Mexico, and between England and Texas, which



directly, on two general grounds, bring the question to issue, and constitute this annexation a *casus belli* against Texas. Our treaty with Mexico stipulates the abolition of slavery. This treaty binds all the parts of the Mexican republic—the separation of a portion from the rest abrogates the treaty in neither; for, if the separation of Texas from Mexico could discharge Texas, so would the separation of Mexico from Texas discharge Mexico: nor can the transfer, however legitimate, of a territory from one crown to another, take off any burden; it passes with its rights and duties, its debts, credits, privileges, and obligations. No more can incorporation with the United States, than separation from Mexico invalidate that treaty; and slavery in Texas is an infraction of that treaty, and if, on appeal, continued, is a *casus belli*.

The treaty is therefore,—

1. A violation of the treaty rights of England in Texas as a part of Mexico, in respect to internal slavery.

2. A violation of the treaty rights of England with Texas, as regards the right of search.

3. A violation of the obligation of Texas to British capitalists, as conjointly contracted with Mexico, and is a usurpation, by the United States, of the property mortgaged to England for the payment of the Mexican debt.

This is on the hypothesis that the United States denies existing obligations. Not denying them, and accepting Texas with its burdens, the United States Government takes upon itself,—

- 1st, The obligations imposed by England's treaty with Mexico, to *extinguish slavery in Texas*—2ndly, to hold the *land mortgaged* to the Mexican bondholders in Texas at their disposal—3dly, to fulfil, with respect to Texas, the mutual obligations of *Right of Visit*.

These obligations, it is for the English Minister to enforce, and here the question is brought to the sim-



plest issue. Not doing so he is guilty. From the moment that the British Minister foregoes those rights, it is no longer for England a question with the United States. Her enemy is within, it is a culprit you have to bring to justice; and, retaining such a one as your Minister,—are you serious when you speak of extrication or relief?

An American statesman, writing subsequently to the signature of the treaty, says :—

“If the Government of the United States, were to acquire Texas, it would acquire along with it all the incumbrances that Texas is under.”

And again,

“Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may; and this responsibility will exist whether there be a stipulation in the treaty or not expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas. For I suppose it to be undeniable, that if one nation becomes incorporated in another, all the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the incorporated nation become the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the common nation created by the incorporation.”

Texas comprises the largest area of conjoined upland and alluvial soil in the known world. It is capable of growing rice, indigo, cotton, sugar, coffee, tobacco, silk, and all tropical produce; it consists of above 200,000,000 acres of flooded and arable land; it is estimated as being capable of forming two slave and three free labour states; 136,000,000 of acres are unoccupied and public property, that is, Mexican property. The remainder is illegally occupied, and is forfeit by violation of the original compact, or has been taken possession of by fraudulent contrivance. This property, equal in dimensions to France, but many times exceeding it in capabilities of production, would, by the treaty, pass into the hands of the Federal Government.



The value will depend entirely on the stream of emigration directed upon the Republic, but exceeding in resources, fertility, and facility of communication, the advantages which any other unoccupied regions possess, it is a property which may be made more rapidly productive than any other of a similar description.

Forty-five millions of acres have been mortgaged to British subjects by the Mexican Government, at five shillings per acre—the Texan Government has disposed of other lands to British adventurers at fifteen shillings; at what sum, then, shall we set down the value of these 350,000 square miles, to the United States? Shall it be 10 millions sterling, or 50, or 100, or 200 millions? The latter is a small sum compared with what that country may produce, and yet it may be the dearest purchase that ever has been made. We must, however, take the United States as intelligently acquiring this property, and therefore calculate on its due application, and in this sense we may rate it at the largest of these sums.

We have seen here that there is one and the same question made out of Texan annexation and slavery abolition. These two are resolved into one by the United States,—they present themselves, therefore, as one to us.

England has paid 20 millions sterling, to do away with slavery in her own colonies, and these colonies are going into decay; the United States establishes slavery in independent regions, making them thereby her own in absolute possession. England has paid about 30 millions to support the independence of an “infant state,” to wit, Mexico; and the land mortgaged to her for repayment of a portion of her lien, passes to the United States: she supporting the “infant” of Texas, breaks England’s lien, and acquires in land four times its amount. Thus has England, on the conjoint Texan and slavery questions, sacrificed £50,000,000—the United States have gained £200,000,000. We, by losing



our money, sacrifice our objects ; they, gaining money, have realised theirs. This booty, secured by the United States is obtained through the very pretence of hostility to England, and by obtaining it, the means are prepared to achieve the confiscation in the North, of other British property infinitely exceeding, for the present, even this gigantic gain ; and that is the territories, mines, and fisheries of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Cape Breton.

But, it may be said, if England's mortgage on Texas is wiped out, she still has recourse against Mexico. What will be the answer of Mexico to such a pretension ? “ You have endeavoured to force us to recognise the independence of a province where you had nothing to do, making it a condition that your own mortgage should be broken, even upon the unoccupied land, our property, which it contained. We protested in your interest against your act—we wipe our hands clean of all bonds to you—and hold you responsible for the loss, thrice exceeding your own, which you have entailed upon us. There stands your own act—there stands our protest recorded against it.”

The message of the President conveying the treaty, is of course a verbose pleading of advantage, and an impudent asserting of pure and upright motives, or repudiation of all spirit of “ unjust aggrandizement.” But the essentials of this document are in reference to *France* and *England*.

France has no possessions to be endangered in the Western Hemisphere. France has herself entertained there projects of aggrandisement ; at one time leaning to schemes for the subversion of the existing powers, at another having recourse to open assaults upon them. Her ambition has been directed thither, not for acquisition only but to gain maritime power, and this has been pursued in secret long years ago, at the direct suggestion of the Russian government, as a means of placing France in hostility with



England.\* France has not long since most cruelly wounded Mexico. It is not then to France that Mexico will turn for protection, either relying on her sense of justice or her good-will, or through apprehensions which she might entertain from Mexico's enemy. All these considerations act in an opposite sense. Further, the feelings of England and France are not estranged only but mutually embittered, and their relations are so precarious that it is attributed as a success and merit to the minister of the latter country that he has kept them at peace. France must, therefore, not only look to ingratiate herself with the United States, but to foster ill-will between them and England. It is with those considerations duly weighed and perfectly understood that the step of Mr. Tyler is taken. But of course the Message can contain no direct allusion to such a subject, and human ingenuity could not contrive the means of bringing France into such a document. *In the very first paragraph appears the word FRANCE!*

“Should this treaty meet with your approval, the government will have succeeded in reclaiming a territory which formerly constituted a portion, as it is confidently believed, of its domain under the Treaty of Cession of 1803,\* by FRANCE to the United States.”

The proposition could only render the matter ludicrous—but that it is a signal flung out to the French people, from whom the United States derive their rights. Absurd as a statement, this becomes respectable as a deception. Mr. Tyler commences then with saying, France is with you: you flatter her by this act; you gratify her hatred to England and encourage it.

It might be supposed in this country, that upon such an occasion all allusion to England would be carefully avoided, as it was England they would have to fear and

\* Chateaubriand's Congress of Verona.

† The treaty of 1803 was abrogated by the treaty of 1819.



propitiate. But the President has only his own compatriots to apprehend, and these he can combat only through the animosity against England, of which he seeks to constitute himself the leader, and which he has in his hands so wonderful an occasion for exasperating.

“Least of all was the Executive ignorant of the anxiety of other Powers to *induce Mexico to enter into terms of reconciliation with Texas*, which, affecting the domestic institutions of Texas, would operate most injuriously upon the United States, and might most seriously threaten the existence of this happy union. Nor could it be unacquainted with the fact, that although foreign Governments might *disavow all design to disturb* the relations which exist under the constitution between these States, *yet that one, the most powerful amongst them, had not failed to declare its marked and decided hostility to the chief features in those relations*, and its purpose, on all suitable occasions, to *urge upon Mexico the adoption of such a course in negotiating with Texas* as to produce the obliteration of that feature from her domestic policy, as one of the conditions of her recognition by Mexico as an independent State. *The Executive was also aware of the fact, that formidable associations of persons, the subjects of foreign Powers, existed, who were directing their utmost efforts to the accomplishment of this object.*”

He then farther goes on to represent, that England had ambitious views upon Texas; he asserts, that the annexation treaty is a measure of self-defence,—*defence against England to be made at the expense of Mexico*. We have before shewn that England supported Texas without enforcing her treaty-right in the abolition of slavery. The correspondence published in America shews that Lord Aberdeen had positively declared against any interposition on the part of England in this matter. Every thing that could favour the designs of the United States upon Texas had, therefore, been done by two successive British governments. More could not have been done had Mr. Tyler dictated



to either English minister his course. Lord Aberdeen had, moreover, explained, in the manner the most satisfactory that could be for Mr. Tyler, his expressions in the House of Lords of the 18th August, and denied the imputation cast upon him. The statements of the President are therefore falsehoods, designed not to deceive but to degrade. The diplomatic documents are published with them, in order that that falsehood may appear. It is in the force of insult, and in the weight of contumely, that his gain lies, because England's degradation.\* And well he knows that he had to deal with one who would neither resist in deed, nor reply in word, and be alike cowed and bewildered by the audacity of the act, and the turpitude of the man. The Anti-Slavery Association is then forced into the service of this inflammatory manifesto, linking its rhetoric and Lord Aberdeen's designs.

This document is for Europe and the world; it is the announcement, as well as the exposition of a startling event. The world is told what Mr. Tyler can dare—and, as they will soon see, with impunity and success. This is in connexion with the question of the Slave Trade, therefore also with the Right of Search; to France and Germany the matter is brought home, and an opportunity afforded to each of adjoining themselves to this harmless course of excitement and popularity. Thus has the English Government by, as it fancies, wishing well to all men and doing their best, succeeded in entangling question after question, and the knot of each difficulty ravel all the cords and tightens all the meshes.†

\* Russia studiously exhibited to the Eastern world the lawlessness of her seizure of the *Vixen*, for, in like manner, in that lay the value to her of the act.

† The project of a discriminating duty on slave-grown sugar comes on the top of this to lay on fresh meshes on the one side, and heap new disturbance to public law on the other. In your treaties wherein



“One circumstance,” says the *Times*, “however, which renders this treaty *more inexplicable* than it would have been at any other moment is, that an armistice, dated the 9th of March, had been concluded between the authorities of Mexico and Texas for the purpose of enabling them to bring their negotiations for the pacification and independence of Texas to a conclusion before the 1st of May. *In this very interval of time, however, and at the very moment at which the Texan Commissioners are supposed to be at the city of Mexico under a safe conduct, for the adjustment of their quarrel and the recognition of their independence,* we learn that another treaty has been signed at Austin to merge this barely acquired sovereignty, this unfledged independence, in the Union; and that not even with the privileges of a State, but in the humbler capacity of a territory, sending one member to the Senate.”

By this suspension of hostilities was the way paved for the annexation treaty, and *this suspension was brought about by the agency of England*. Her intervention was made public by proclamation in Texas! England, then, by Mr. Tyler's act, appears in Mexico as conspiring against her with the United States. She is, by Mr. Tyler's word, represented in Europe and America as conspiring against the United States with Mexico! England has neither a hand to resist nor a tongue to deny; she has only a hand for her foes' assistance, and a tongue for his use. Mr. Tyler, can at once employ her docile agency and denounce her insidious designs.

---

MEANS USED BY THE UNITED STATES' GOVERNMENT TO  
OBTAIN THE TREATY FROM TEXAS.

The United States have presented themselves in this act, and throughout, as fostering and protecting the Texas—you have granted the “rights of the most favoured nation,” you asked no question about slaves and contrived no provision against their produce. What is this pandering to declaimers at home but furnishing new bitterness to those who are not your foes and new weapons to those who are?



but their protection has been that of the “wolf to the lamb,” according to the simile which they seem to delight to apply to England in their *official documents*—their protection has been the hug of the bear, such as Serbia or Wallachia have felt; but here the design is not covered with Muscovite art, it is openly and unblushingly avowed. In the English manifesto, on declaring war, there would require nothing but their own words hereafter quoted.

The American Secretary of State directs the most intent care and anxiety to be given to prevent Texas from acquiring “*a separate legislature*,” or even a “*quasi independence*.”\*

The proposal of annexation did not proceed from Texas; there is not even a collusive supplication obtained from the weak state; it is on the proposal, and the *threat* of the strong! It was first made after the conversation in the House of Lords, and was finally and absolutely urged, after the receipt of Lord Aberdeen’s *explanations*, in a lengthened despatch, dated Washington, 16th of January, 1844. But before examining this document, it is necessary to state that the present proposal must not be confounded with that originally made to the United States by the Texan Government. That proposal came while as yet no act of Congress had been passed, and when the band of freebooters had not been dandled and swaddled by foreign diplomacy, and docketted with the style and title of independence and of sovereignty. While distracted between the agonies of pretension and the anxieties of alarm, they proposed not to become an annexed territory, or to extinguish themselves as a state; they offered an “amalgamation of flags” only, and association to the Union, “with full reservation of their sovereign rights.” This the United States rejected, but recognized their independence. Texas then formally withdrew the proposal, in order to facilitate negotiations for recognition by the powers of Europe: and it was on the impresssion conveyed of reality in that independence, and

\* Despatch of Mr. Upshur, November 18, 1843.



of the absence of designs on the part of the United States, evinced by the rejection of the proposal of annexation, that the recognition of Texas was obtained from the European Governments, or excused by those Governments to their nations. These results being now realized, again in 1842, as we learn from a note of the Mexican Commissioners,\* an informal renewal of the negotiation on the part of Texas took place. On what terms we are not informed, but it was again withdrawn in *August last*—that is to say, at the very time of the conversation in the House of Lords, which gave to the United States the occasion to proceed, as already shewn. The proposal was made on the 16th October.

After commenting on the rejection by Texas of its proposal, the American Government proceeds to say—

*“It is quite natural that they should be disinclined to hazard the friendship of other powers, and particularly of England, by an appeal to the United States, which might not be successful.”*

It then applies itself to remove grounds of ill-will and doubts of the readiness of the nation to come into the views of the President, which he is ready to support by his “*treaty-making power*.”

“When the measure was first suggested, although the entire south was in favour of it, as they still are, it found few friends among the statesmen of the other states. Now, the north, to a great extent, are not only favourable to, but anxious for it, and every day increases the popularity of the measure among those who originally opposed it. Measures have been taken to ascertain the opinions and views of senators upon the subject, and it is found that a clear constitutional majority of two-thirds are in favour of the measure. There is not, in my opinion, the slightest doubt of the ratification of a treaty of annexation, should Texas agree to make one.”

The representative of the United States is instructed “to urge” upon the Texan President “the absolute necessity of

\* 15th April, 1844.



annexation, with reference to the interests, and *possibly the safety*, of both countries."

The despatch then deals with the question of England, and repeats the arguments used with the Minister in London, which, by such use must acquire certainly increased efficacy with the Texan Government.

"My views are, in fact, disclosed in a despatch addressed to Mr. Everett, at London, of which a copy is enclosed. To these may be added the following considerations:—*What motive can England have for a disinterested friendship towards Texas?* Friendship between nations is never disinterested, but in this case even the common feeling of national kindness cannot be presumed to exist. The policy of England is purely commercial. Her object is to engross the commerce of the world; by diplomacy, if she can, and by force if she must. On this subject she will expect, and ultimately compel, concessions from Texas, which Texas, once surrendered to her influence and protection, will not have the power to refuse. The consequence will be to disgust and irritate other nations, and particularly the United States. We are even now the great rivals of England in commerce and manufactures. It is a favourite object with her to cripple us in both these branches of our industry, and for that reason she is pushing her influence in every commercial mart of the world."

It then shews that a connexion between Texas and England must lead to collision between Texas and the United States; and upon this proceeds to threaten the Republic.

"We have it in our power to do more injury to the commerce, and, incidentally, to the agriculture of Texas, in time of peace, than all the other countries of the world combined; and for the same reason, we can benefit her in equal degree. It is not to be supposed that we shall feel any hesitation on this subject, if Texas shall reject our overtures, and throw herself into the arms of England. *Instead of being, as we ought to be, the closest friends, it is inevitable that we shall become the bitterest foes. In this feeling all parts of our country will participate.* The north, which is the most



influential in the policy of our government, will entertain it more strongly than the south ; because their great and leading interests, particularly in New England, must fall a sacrifice to this hostile policy on the part of Texas."

So that, while the commercial policy of Great Britain, and her activity in executing or planning thirty-seven commercial treaties, has the effect, as avowed by their negotiator, of "choking up the old channels of commerce," they are nevertheless successful in furnishing to America arguments by which to unite nations against us, and coerce, by threats, independent states not only into submission, but to the surrender of their existence.

The American Secretary then proceeds to the subject of slavery :—

"I have commented upon this topic in the despatch to Mr. Everett. I will only add, *that if Texas should not be attached to the United States she cannot maintain that institution ten years, and probably not half that time.*

"You will readily perceive that, with such causes as these at work, a long continuance of peace between that country and the United States is absolutely impossible. War is inevitable. England will be a party to it from necessity, if not from choice ; and the other great powers of the world will not be idle spectators of a contest involving such momentous results. I think it almost certain that the peace of the civilized world, the stability of long-established institutions, and the destinies of millions, both in Europe and America, hang on the decision which Texas shall now pronounce. What has she to hope in this conflict of stronger powers ? She will find herself between the upper and the nether millstones, ground to powder in their revolutions."

Finally, the conditions of annexation are thus stated :—

"*To admit her people to a full participation in its government, and a full share in its promising destinies.*"

We have seen how this condition is fulfilled in the treaty.



We must here notice means of another description. The Texan Commissioners present the following statement of the debts of the Republic, as “extracted from a Report of the Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of Texas, made on the 12th January, 1841:”—

|                                                                                                         | Dollars.               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| “Funded debt, bearing interest 10 per cent. .                                                           | 1,650,000              |
| “Bonds sold and pledged, bearing interest 10 per cent. . . . .                                          | 1,350,000              |
| “Treasury notes, without interest . . . . .                                                             | 3,000,000              |
| “Debts of various descriptions, <i>say</i> audited drafts, and other claims, without interest . . . . . | 1,000,000              |
| “Total . . . . .                                                                                        | <hr/> 7,000,000” <hr/> |

This account includes *accumulated interest*; the interest, therefore, not having been paid, while rated at 10 per cent., shews the stock, however created, to have been worthless, and, therefore, the charge to be fictitious. The two latter items “treasury notes,” and various, “*say audited* drafts,” present nothing tangible; and this is a statement made out by a Committee of the Texan speculators. The two first items alone bear interest, which, in the course of three years, would, at their nominal rate, amount to 900,000 dollars. The Commissioners allow that, since that period, “the revenues of the Government have more than equalled its expenditure.” This is the account they bring forward at the moment that the United States’ Government is pressing in the most instant manner, the annexation, and when, therefore, they may make their own terms. Their whole debt, under these circumstances, falls 2,000,000 of dollars short of the sum set down in the treaty. But the Report of the Texan Government, in the same year, (1841) sets down the debt at between four and five millions of dollars! The American Government now undertakes to pay 10,000,000 dollars. Here, then, are at least 5,000,000 dollars,



that is above a million sterling, appropriated for the purpose of bribery ! For this sum, however, the lands of Texas are mortgaged, that is to say, Texas (supposing the land its own) is purchased with its own money, to its own undoing. But these lands are Mexican and not Texan, they have in part been transferred to England, so that this money is procured at the expense first of Mexico, and then of England ; or, in other words, England has placed a million sterling at the disposal of Mr. Tyler, to enable him to bribe the Legislature, and the authorities of Texas, into a surrender of themselves and their trust, in order to give such importance to the anti-British feelings in the United States, that Mr. Tyler may be re-elected President of the Union.

Nothing so curious has been narrated of the Arabian Nights. Yet the glorious British nation, for whose relaxation from its severer studies and occupations these exhibitions are prepared, seem to fail to derive from them the amusement which future generations will suppose they were calculated to afford, either by the merit or the cost of the performance.

Here are menaces of irresistible power directed against Texas, to constrain her to self-sacrifice, joined to false profession and corruption. Is not this tantamount to invasion ? And if it was our duty before to defend Mexico—this despatch imposes the additional obligation of protecting Texas.

While Mexico and England are pursued with open rancour, Texas, as now published by themselves, has been the object of covered perfidy. Not less has been the treachery of the Government to its own free nation, from whom the plot was concealed until it had ripened for execution. And this is the act of the *model* republic ; and it is the people which does such things, and doing avows them, that have taken the stars of Heaven for its emblem, and for its colours the hues that indicate innocence and love !



## WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

It requires that some difference should be pending between two States for war to be made, into the justice of which neutrals have to inquire. There are no grievances of the United States to which Mexico refuses redress—there are no demands of Mexico which the United States will not acknowledge.

The fact of civil war does confer the character of independence, with the rights of belligerents to both parties; and it is open to any neutral appealed to by the revolted province, if it judged its cause just, to declare war against the parent State. In that case it would be for the United States *to declare war against Mexico*. It would then be for other States to judge of the justice or of the objects of such declaration, and to deal with it accordingly. In taking this course, there must have been grounds, and their hands must have been clean, and no creating of revolt by secret machination, to be afterwards defended by open violence. This is not attempted. Yet this was the only form in which the case could have been presented, to throw around it the least complication, as brought to the test of the Laws of Nations, and of civilized communities.

The United States does not make war against Mexico, but lays hold on Texas, and leaves Mexico to find redress where and how she can.\* The act is therefore one of that character which brands the United States, not only with unjust and ambitious violence, but which

\* “A deadly hatred burns in Mexico towards this country. No stronger national sentiment now binds the scattered provinces together, than *dread* and detestation of Republican America. Suspicion, dread, and abhorrence, have supplanted respect and trust.”—Dr. Channing in 1834.



stamps it a "*pirate State*," making it the enemy of mankind, and imposing on all neighbours within the sphere of their operations, the obligation to protect Mexico, as a first necessary measure of self-defence.

We have first, then, anxiously to inquire, and devoutly to pray that Mexico, "the Circassia of the West," may have heart and strength to assert her rights and ours, and those of human nature, and it is with delight that we are enabled to quote the following words of indignation, with which the Mexican Government has met the announcement of the Annexation Treaty:—

"The usurpation of Texas (for its annexation to the United States can be called by no other name) would be an *open declaration of war against Mexico* by the United States; and doubtless is only the precursor of other ambitious movements which many of their papers are already in plain terms predicting. It happens that the Spanish-American race does not admit the superiority claimed in favour of the Anglo-Saxon race; and even if they did, Mexico would know how to defend with glory the territory which she was able by her *unaided* arm to render independent of the mother country, and to maintain her honour and rights, or perish in the attempt, sooner than submit to an insult so degrading. In future she could not count upon her own safety, nor even her political existence, should she permit a friendly nation to erect itself into a conqueror of her territory, by means so degrading, shameful (*vergonzoso*) and perfidious."—*Diario del Gobierno*.

The American nation is, however, not yet that "pirate state," but becomes so by this act if completed. A seal is then set to the compact between the present opposing tendencies of the Union. "No Texas!" recently exclaimed the southernns; then "no Oregon!" "No Oregon!" exclaimed the northernns; then "no Texas!" The annexation of Texas was the condition upon which the Southern States should consent in the usurpation of Oregon—the usurpation of Oregon the condition upon which the Northern



States should assent to the annexation of Texas. But as England might be so far dreaded as yet to enforce moderation, they are involved in a preliminary contest with an enemy whom they despise. The American nation does not rush on in united vehemence of lustful guilt—it is entrapped. There are those who appeal to the lingering sense of integrity in the breasts of their countrymen, and look around for every argument that can give weight to their words or arrest by the fear of consequences. They appeal to—*England*, to her rights, her interests, her duty, and her power; they invoke those interests and that power!

If covetousness for Texas has prompted cupidity for Oregon and Canada, so has covetousness of Oregon strengthened and confirmed cupidity for Texas. Had there not been British possessions in North America, Texas might not have been invaded; and if there were not hatred for England in the United States, Mexico might not have been doomed to destruction. If, therefore, England had here no interest at stake, she is in justice bound to rescue Mexico, even were it required to have recourse to those extreme means of arms and coercion, which she is so accustomed on other occasions to employ. But while the Americans do reckon upon a war with Mexico—they have no idea of danger from England! So in the usurpation of the Oregon, it is not England, but the Red Indians that cause alarm! In every case England furnishes but a theme for eloquence in the enormity of her crimes, and temptation for rapacity in the vastness of her possessions.

But the American Government have grounded their act—one not of war, but far worse—of robbery against Mexico, on the statements in Parliament of the British Minister. All that Lord Aberdeen has to say, is—"You have acted without *provocation*, for we (England) had



really no design to supplant the authority of Mexico in Texas, or to establish our own." The explanation is not accepted.\* The original declaration is insisted on—the measure persevered in. There the official declaration stands; it is England that the United States assails, and Mexico is subjected to this war in consequence of a difference between the United States and England;† England disavows the truth of the allegation, but leaves the United States to proceed, and Mexico to perish.

This question presents itself to the British Cabinet as a surprise, no doubt, in the first instance; but it will soon be considered merely as an embarrassment, occasioned, not by the pretensions of the United States, but by the resistance of Mexico. Then will come the idea of conciliating the good-will of the United States by pressing Mexico to a surrender, which will limit the duration of her trouble, and diminish the amount of her sacrifices. You cannot stand neuter; not supporting Mexico you must bring your weight to depress and subdue her.

Tunis was Lord Aberdeen's first embarrassment, when

\* The *New York American* remarks—"The correspondence which in some surreptitious way has got before the public, presents grave cause for reflection in the tone of the letter from our Secretary of State to Mr. Pakenham, respecting the alleged interference by England with slavery in Texas. Any purpose of such interference having been explicitly disclaimed on behalf of his Government by Lord Aberdeen, the persistence with which Mr. Calhoun undertakes to prove inferentially that this disclaimer cannot be true, is anything but courteous or conciliatory."

† A pretty contrast this, to the invasion of Caubul—because of a pretended difference with Russia, and because the Prince of Caubul had admitted an agent of Russia at the *request of the agent of England*. We do present riddles to the world, but cannot read them ourselves.



assailed by France. He considered that the best way of settling the matter, was siding with the strong; consequently he threatened the Porte with a junction of the English and French fleets, if they should maintain their sovereign rights; he had thus also the opportunity of conciliating a powerful ally, and France, as all the world knows, has been from that time indissolubly bound to England. Serbia was his next great embarrassment, that Province being assailed by Russia. He adopted a somewhat similar plan: he mitigated the wrong by undertaking to execute it; vituperated as "*semi-barbarous*" the people that clung to their rights—and as "*intemperate*," the Prince that opposed Russia. The embarrassment being got rid of, the gratitude of Russia has been secured to England by incalculable obligations. Why should not Mexico in like manner be saved from inexpedient pretensions, and the occasion seized to propitiate our Anglo-Saxon brethren—and complete the circle of good will and affection between the great powers of the earth?

Happy era! when the harsh dictates of justice have been supplanted by the benign promptings of humanity, and the rude barriers of law have given place before the softening influences of expediency.

Let us suppose the case, that Mexico, by patiently submitting, should not afford us this standing ground, would that deprive us of the right of resistance or diminish the obligation to do so? No, it would only diminish our facilities, and increase our dangers.

On the accession of the present Ministry, they had to do what their predecessors had left undone, and enforce against Texas the treaty with Mexico respecting slavery; which done, the thorn and poison was extracted from the transaction. Had they been prepared to enforce even the subsequent treaty with Texas, a bar



would have been placed to this attempt, and of course the knowledge of their determination would have prevented this *coup d'état*, which in that case could only recoil upon its authors. This is not done—*they are not even left in suspense*. Lord Aberdeen is communicative and busy. He converses with the excellent person representing the United States—he writes letters to Mr. Pakenham—he has interviews with the abolitionists, and makes proposals to the Mexican envoy; where England and the United States are opposed, he reconciles himself with them and is confidential; where Mexico is concerned, takes counsel with “the excellent person,” that is, conspires with Mr. Tyler; he presses poor devoted Mexico into the breach, and places her in the alternative of doing what England disqualified her from attempting, or of losing Lord Aberdeen’s grace and favour. And this is a conscientious man’s service, who strains to overtake his duties, and who would do nothing he knows to be wrong. With the utmost sincerity he reveals his predilections for the “promising young state,” his wishes to support it with money; he then frankly avows the discomfiture of his project. With this integrity and unwonted simplicity of character, he has brought upon England shame, and confirmed her in the path to ruin; and there have been, before now, men whose good qualities were more dangerous and fatal to their country, than if they had been engaged in the blackest designs, and prompted by the direst passions.

What would have been the conduct of France, if Greece, while struggling with Turkey, had been incorporated by England, even although Greece had not been a name only for a horde of English adventurers, entering insidiously under the garb of allegiance and submission to Turkey? Although England had not been assaulting the provinces of France, and preparing for her dismemberment by the previous dismemberment of Turkey, would



the French people not have arisen from the Rhone to the Alps, from the Channel to the Mediterranean, as one man, to wreak vengeance on such perfidy? What their turpitude had they quietly acquiesced? And what, still more, if the England that had planned this treaty was a weak and contemptible power, unable to resist for a single day the armaments of France, and pursuing these insidious practices only on the calculation of her unlimited endurance and irredeemable imbecility? Such, however, is the design which the United States have planned, such the infamy which England has endured, and they now combine to startle the world with its sufferance and execution.

We now come to the great question, Will the treaty be ratified? But what means such a question at the present day? Has not England executed a treaty *without ratification*? Did not that very treaty stipulate that it should be executed without ratification?\* Did any one question that act? Was it so much as noticed? To England, then, a treaty is binding in its signature, and not in its ratification. And as regards her, the United States have their case clear, if not taking her stand now when it is signed, she attempt to resist when it shall be ratified.

The authority that ratifies, is the same that negotiates. Powers of negotiation, are given to obtain credence for the negotiators from the opposite party, and therefore are they exchanged. Ratification is withheld merely as a security against the exceeding of their powers by the negotiators. A case of refusing ratification cannot have reference to differences of the negotiating authority with itself, but to the conduct of the negotiations with respect to the opposite

\* Treaty of July 15, 1840, where England (or Russia through her) dragged along with her Austria and Prussia, and France, in opposing the treaty, did not dare to take her stand on this violation of public law.



party. Ratification has been withheld hitherto only on such occasions, or on the discovery of some plot or design, which, if discovered after the ratification, would have broken up the treaty itself.\*

In the United States, the consent of the Senate is constitutionally requisite for the ratification of a treaty, but so it is for its negotiation. To negotiate a treaty in the United States without the consent of the Senate, is as great an usurpation on the part of the President, as to execute it without its ratification. The case of assent or dissent cannot arise at this stage of the proceedings. Here is therefore a concerted fraud between the parties, or an inability on the part of the Senate to comprehend, or an indisposition to support its rights. The second alternative would be equally dangerous with the first; but both are conjoined. In some there is collusive assent, in others, indistinct, and therefore futile opposition. Instantaneously the question is raised from insignificance to magnitude by the mere fact, that it is presented in a novel and *fallacious* manner. The ingenuity of its managers in displacing constitutional practice, is a further addition to its importance.

We would however earnestly press on the American citizens one consideration which may touch them. While they are confused between the signing and the ratifying of a treaty, that is debating where there is no difference,—they are in reality surrendering *liberty* and *power*. A President has used the diplomacy of the state for his purposes, committed the nation before it was aware, and where he has exercised a flagrant usurpation occupies it in a sophistical dispute.

\* The refusal of France to ratify her treaty respecting the Slave Trade, is a new incident in the history of the world, presented by the imbecility of a Minister (M. Guizot) who could not judge of what he could effect, and who escaped from the embarrassment of attempting too much, by subverting further international practice and right.



He prepares to carry a project of his own by corrupting and seducing the very Senate whose authority he has defied and overthrown. As a *minister* in England can plot in secret and use the arm of the nation to do his work, and then pervert that nation's mind into approval of his acts ; so now has a *President* of the United States in like manner discovered the facility of doing any thing with a people vehement in proclaiming its liberty. If that liberty is dear to them—if it be not a pretence and a deceit, let them now assert it in the only manner in which it can be preserved.—  
*The impeachment of Mr. Tyler.*

In a recent report of the Committee on Federal Relations, respecting “admission into the harbour of the United States of free persons of colour,” there are some remarks on the “Treaty-making power” which are worthy of consideration in connexion with the Texan Treaty.

It is there argued that the Senate, being composed not according to the general population of the Union, but to the number of States, were the Treaty-making power to overrule the separate legislation of the States, the greater States would lose their preponderance, “and the *Federal Government* could do by *treaty* what *Congress* could not by *Law*.” The basis of the reasoning is the Senate's constitutional authority *in making treaties*, and the object of the argument is to represent that authority as one that might become despotic and alarming. Contemporaneously we have the President making treaties himself, *without consulting the Senate*. Has the plain sense to substitute “this is a usurpation ;” for “will the Senate ratify ?” If there was reason to apprehend the usurpation *of* the Senate, is there none to apprehend the usurpation *from* the Senate ? If the Senate could be dangerous merely as yielding to the inclinations of the weaker States, will that danger be diminished by its being converted into a tool of the Executive Government ?



In the same report these words occur :

“ A question of vital importance occurs—‘How far the Treaty-making power can bind the States?’ This depends upon the previous question, ‘How far the States have yielded by the federal compact their individual sovereignty?’ The *Constitution vests in the President the power to make treaties by and with the advice of the Senate, &c.*”

To the question of “vital importance,” as to the limit of the Treaty-making power, comes now to be added the question of much graver importance as to who is to exercise the Treaty-making power? The first they have not answered, the second they do not ask. The first is a prospective fear, the second a consummated act. The first is to be decided by the constitution when it arises, by the second the constitution is upset.

Mr. Clay touches on the subject—weakly and inefficiently, but still he touches.

“ Assuming that the Annexation of Texas is war with Mexico, is it competent to the Treaty-making power to plunge this country into war, not only without the concurrence of, but without deigning to consult Congress, to which, by the constitution, belongs exclusively the power of declaring war?”

His letter, however, furnishes far deeper colouring for this usurpation, for when he speaks of danger which the Mexican war must bring if England sides with her, and of the burden of the treaty rights and pecuniary obligations weighing on Texas, which the United States will assume—of the abhorrence of the world against a nation plunging into a war of unprovoked aggression, to sustain a practice repudiated by mankind, he only enumerates consequences directly flowing from the violation of the American constitution by its President, not in usurping the powers of Congress, but in superseding in fact and deed the functions of the Senate. All this might have been done by the Senate and by the Congress—without any constitutional infraction,



but as it is done, the President usurps from Congress the powers of war, from the Senate of negotiation—and he looks to public opinion to justify him—that is, he seeks to change the nation by his crime, and to convert that crime into a means of greatness.

The following reflections of Mr. Clay, valuable to us on other grounds, present for the United States most alarming considerations.

“I was aware, too, that holders of Texan land and Texan scrip, and speculators in them, were actively engaged in promoting the object of annexation. Still, I did not believe that any executive of the United States would venture upon so grave and momentous a proceeding, not only without any general manifestation of public opinion in favour of it, but in direct opposition to strong and decided expressions of public disapprobation. But it appears that I was mistaken.”

Again:—

“Such a principle, put into practical operation, would menace the existence, if it did not certainly sow the seeds of a dissolution of the Union. It would be to proclaim to the world an insatiable and unquenchable thirst for foreign conquest or acquisition of territory. *For if to-day Texas be acquired to strengthen one part of the confederacy, to-morrow Canada may be required to add strength to another.* And after that might have been obtained, *still other and further acquisitions would become necessary to equalise and adjust the balance of political power.* Finally, in the progress of this spirit of universal dominion, the part of the confederacy which is now weakest, would find itself still weaker, from the impossibility of securing new theatres for those peculiar institutions which it is charged with being desirous to extend.”

Shall these warnings be disregarded, and England's acquiescence be the triumph of Mr. Tyler? The formal character of a treaty will give authority to the project, and implicate the *nation* in its furtherance. Texas will appear a suppliant, which is exposed by its predilections for them, and whom it would be ungenerous to cast off.



On these grounds, we much doubt whether internal resistance will be sufficient to frustrate this design, nor do we look upon its realization as immediate. Such would not be even advantageous to the promoters; it would lose thereby to them its agitational value.

England, on her side, will be puzzled between treaty and ratification, and looking to the point of ratification to take its stand, the Government *will wait*; by not acting at once they will have done their worst. The Americans *will wait also*, to allow the talk to be expended. They will reject the treaty—knowing its rejection to be a step towards its acceptance—England will accept the rejection as a triumph. The next time it comes before the Senate, it will be no longer a novelty for England, and therefore not worth thinking of. What would an *occasion* be if it endured always! Would genius be commended if mediocrity insured success, or knowledge esteemed, if ignorance conferred security?

At the beginning of Van Buren's administration, repugnance to the Texan scheme was still so strong, that they positively seized a vessel, the *Pelican*, which was fitted out to assist the Texans. The last act of Van Buren's career was to recognize the independence of Texas. At the commencement of Mr. Tyler's Presidency the annexation of Texas was as much reprobated as in the former period their recognition; the last act of his authority is a Treaty for its annexation.

In the mean time every encouragement is given from England. The first outbreak of indignation of the public press might have had its effect were England without a government or America without an envoy. But there is Lord Aberdeen in England and Mr. Everett from America. But Lord Aberdeen may have been shocked by perfidy, to which even he could scarcely remain longer blind, and have proved restive or wrapped himself up in dogged



silence, but Lord Aberdeen has spoken, and, as with Russia, while the press exasperates the minister invites.

Lord Brougham has here rendered his usual service of dragging to light and revealing the nakedness of the land.\* Having expressed his surprise that it should have been upon a conversation *with him* that the American government had justified its act, and having demanded explanation, Lord Aberdeen said that he "*believed the case was wholly without example in the history of public law.*"

What would be expected if in the case of an atrocious murder, the judge before whom the criminal was tried, said, this is wholly unexampled in the history of law? You would know that the man was an idiot; but what if you could not get rid of him as a judge, and if all the *people* saw nothing strange but something remarkably spirited in the expression? Afterwards Lord Aberdeen says, that if the treaty were carried into effect:—

"He should be prepared to state his *opinion* to the house, and to do that which was consistent with his duty as a minister of the crown, and which the public service might require."

Lord Aberdeen has already done all that is requisite; he has declared it to be law—public law—extraordinary indeed, but still law—very much to be deplored, but still law—very desirable that the majority of the senate should reject it, but they would be very wrong to reject it, seeing that it is law: *when it is carried into effect*—whatever the opinion which he will be "prepared to state," his "duty as a

\* Lord Brougham can injure England also by suppression. A conversation in the House of Lords, in which Lord Beaumont denounced the *recent interference with the laws of Turkey*, AND WHICH WAS RESPONDED TO BY LORD ABERDEEN BY A HEARTY HEAR, HEAR, was suppressed by all the papers at the suggestion of Lord Brougham.



minister of the crown, and the public service" will require him to recognize that law. Lord Brougham was, of course, content, having got the "satisfactory information" on the subject which he had asked. And after this interruption the House proceeded to business upon—the Dublin and Cashel Railway.

There is but one course for England to take, not two courses. There is but one time for England to act, and there is not a moment for delay. There is one path of duty, one of right, one of necessity, one of security, one of honour—glorious, unheard-of occasion, all these are one! There is no time requisite to deliberate, there are no longings interposed by the necessity of delay to the grasping of such a fortune. It requires no treaty of common defence with Mexico, no compulsion by arms of Texas; and it is not necessary to shatter to atoms the pretentious republic. Mexico revives in strength and security; Texas eschews slavery; the United States punish the insolent offender, and make atonement for his offence, without suffering in their lives and fortunes, and with the recovery of their rights and honour—for all this it requires only to be known that there is in England a Minister, such as Channing described and supposed a Minister of England to be. Such a man would know that the navies and armies of England are weapons not to perpetrate crimes, but to use in her own defence. "A terrible thing," says de Maistre, "would be a robust child." What is an empire oppressing the earth with terrific power, yet less in mind than a child?

We are not left to guess what the effect of an upright and a bold course would be upon the United States itself or on Europe. The following passage from Mr. Clay recognizes the shamelessness of his country's acts, the right of England, or, indeed, of any power to protect Mexico, and points out the means of doing so. We make no apology



for fortifying by quotations positions of such vital importance, on the appreciation of which our very existence will soon be seen to depend. We are upon the very turn of the affairs of the world, and the chance of making this matter clear imposes the endeavour by every means to accomplish it.

“Honour and good faith and justice are equally due from this country towards the weak as towards the strong. And, if an act of injustice were to be perpetrated towards any power, it would be more compatible with the dignity of the nation, and, in my judgment, less dishonourable to inflict it upon a powerful instead of a weak foreign nation. But are we perfectly sure that we should be free from injury in a state of war with Mexico? Have we any security that countless numbers of foreign vessels, under the authority and flag of Mexico, would not prey upon our defenceless commerce in the Mexican gulf, on the Pacific ocean, and on every other sea and ocean? Have we any certain guarantee that Mexico would obtain no allies among the great European powers? Suppose Great Britain and France, or one of them, were to take part with Mexico, and, by a manifesto, were to proclaim that their objects were to assist a weak and helpless ally to check the spirit of encroachment and ambition of an already overgrown republic, seeking still further acquisitions of territory, to maintain the independence of Texas, disconnected with the United States, and to prevent the further propagation of the slave trade from the United States—*what would be the effect of such allegations upon the judgment of an impartial and enlightened world?*”

Nor are we without the means of justifying Mr. Clay's estimate of the effect upon mankind of such a course, if adopted by England. The Government, from whom resistance alone could be apprehended, thus deals with the question, through its organ the *Journal des Debats*.

“A country which, like France, has taken so glorious a part in the abolition of slavery, should energetically condemn the language openly held by the Government of the United States. We have before us the correspondence exchanged between Mr. Upshur, Mr.



Calhoun, Mr. Everett, and Mr. Pakenham ; and all the notes written on the part of the United States are, from beginning to end, not only an apology, but an *audacious justification of the principle of slavery* ; while nearly all the rest of the Christian world is making immense sacrifices to deliver society from this hideous leprosy that has so long disfigured it, the United States alone defend it in language of the most revolting nature. These are the terms in which republican and democratic governments understand humanity, equality, and liberty !”

But sowing time and harvest season come, and depart alike in vain, when there are none to sow and none to reap ; and so will these favourable dispositions fade away. Fortune belongs of right to the acting hand ; and never since the world has rolled on, was mere energy possessed of such power as now ; for right and wrong being obliterated, the boldest will ever be the best. Here, then, was the chance of arresting the growing hostile dispositions of France and of the United States ; and, that occasion lost, these will be strengthened, if only by the additional evidence of fatuity presented in our neglect.

“ Is it needful to urge the English Government to such a course ?” a stranger might say, “ is it not rather the task of those who look to rights to restrain the too ready use of weapons and exercise of power. Have not armies been pushed into distant regions, because of the mere presence there of the envoy of a friendly power ? Have not expeditions been sent all round the globe to be themselves the bearers of a simple demand for payment for smuggled goods, and used their weapons in destroying cities, to enforce it without having made it ? Have we not seen the fortresses of Syria blown into the air, because a subordinate Government had a difference with its principal ? Have we not seen the navies of England used in a civil quarrel between a sovereign and his subjects, where they were sent as ‘ mediators ?’ What shall be the terrible and rapid ven-



geance that such a Government will exercise against a not unworthy foe, and in a case no less of provocation than of justice !” He who should speak thus would be strange to England in our times, and he would have to learn that the load-stone of England was crime, and that injustice was her inducement, whether to inflict or suffer at any cost.

Keep the law and the law will keep you ; break the law and the law will break you. Our feet have been in the paths of iniquity, our hands have been imbrued in innocent blood, we have enacted before the world on the grandest scale the character of destroyer and spoiler.— Shall you not then be a spoil to another destroyer? We have imitated the American citizens in Texas—can we resist their deeds because we suffer? We who have been every where removing our neighbours’ landmark—shall we hold firm our own? We have substituted might for right; and those who do so are smitten with cowardice, and are dismayed by the God they have raised on high. Shall we tell the Mexicans that they can confide in our sense of justice?—can we call upon the Americans to renounce their projects? A shout of laughter would be the answer to our appeal, and a finger of scorn would point to Scinde, China, and Affghanistan. These were the encouragements to American ambition—these the strength of her injustice—these the blight of English power, the load upon her heart, the mark upon her brow, and the curse upon her faith. Until justice be done, lustration be made throughout the land, atonement before heaven and upon earth,—England can resist no aggression. Till then injustice is sacred and inviolable in her eyes—unassailable by her weapons, and irresistible by her power.

This is not a weakness of a part, it is a disease of the body, it circulates through the limbs, it is propelled from the heart, it invigorates with the strength of delirium, it



poisons the whole frame, and the gangrene which is revealed in the limb which we are now examining, will affect every limb progressively of which the body is composed; and as in respect to the neighbouring state of America our guilt has developed in them crime, and armed in them injustice, so will every other neighbour be rendered dangerous by the passions we have inspired, and coalesced by the mightiness of the plunder which we offer to their confederated cupidity. "This treason," exclaimed Cicero upon a memorable occasion, "is directed against the state, its gods, the senate in which we stand, against every one of you—against the world." So is this treason under which England lies guilty and suffering, a treason against the faith which we profess, the laws which we obey, the constitution we uphold, the nation we compose, the subjects we possess—against the very enemies we arouse, against human nature and the world itself.

And can it be that dangers so mighty shall raise no deliverer?

The possession of power and dominion involves duties corresponding with fortune, and if our rights are sacred, it is only when our obligations have been kept. The yoke of obligation has long been broken by this nation, and now behold the fruits—calling itself free, it despises, even to the very knowledge, its affairs, until they are confused, and then it is interested because of novelty, and the slumber of its reason is succeeded by the vehemence of its passions. It is because England has neglected the management of her affairs and called them "foreign," that these results have been brought, and these fatal passions instilled on either side of the Atlantic. It is but two months since we entered at considerable length into the position of England in the Western Hemisphere, and these two months have sufficed to give the character of prophecy to the statements there contained, but it is years since the very



same things have been asserted, the same explanation given of mysterious acts, the same sequence pointed out as their necessary result. Common characters have been shewn in the Boundary Differences, from the setting aside the award of the King of Holland, the Caroline negotiations, the Texan Recognition and Treaty, the support given to France in her blockade of Mexico, &c. all tending to and necessarily bringing estrangement and hatred between the United States and England, while simultaneously a similar process was bringing a similar result between France and England. If, then, there were those who did foresee and who laboured to prevent, may there not have been those who did foresee and laboured to effect? And what is it that was foreseen by those, the value of whose warnings has been confirmed by results, it was not that the wind or the storm, it was not that chance and "tendencies" should bring those things, but that they should *be done*, that there was a purpose to be gained by doing them, and that in that purpose were involved men who having the power to act for nations, could blind them and then drive them mad.

As we have before said, this attempt on the part of the United States would be, were there men in England to deal with it, not an embarrassment, and not a danger, but a most glorious opportunity; neglected, however, as it will be, it becomes a fatal calamity. Mexico surrendered, England becomes of necessity the satellite of the United States in the West, as she is of Russia in the East; the only hope of nations for their defence becomes the dupe and instrument of their assailant.

Mexico abandoned, of course you then abandon the Oregon, and Mexico surrendered and the Oregon abandoned, what hearts will your colonists in North America have to defend your sovereignty? They will not be the pivot of your action and the body of your strength; it will



be against them that your power, if exerted at all, must be directed. The provinces who formerly defended you against your neighbours, will invite those neighbours against you. Deal with the question in Mexico : support that state ; give it strength and confidence in your support ; beat down the projects of America by that strength of Mexico and your resistance, and you will have no struggle to maintain. The knowledge of your decision then, to do justice in favour of a foreign power, will save you from a disgraceful surrender of your own territory, and will save you from the otherwise inevitable dismemberment of your own empire. All that is wanted is a word, but that word must be spoken by a man. But to do this, England must become different from what she is. The present ministers, whatever their good intentions, can do nothing ; their hands are bound by our past crimes, and that load of crime cannot be thrown off till the nation abhors it ; the nation cannot abhor it till it understands it, and no crime, as no law, can be understood, except by judicial investigation of facts. Parliamentary inquiry into our past conduct,—that inquiry which Sir R. Peel resisted as inexpedient for the public service,—alone can save England from dismemberment in America, from a war with France and the United States, and finally from being PROTOCOLISED ; that is to say, extinguished as an independent power. Her independence cannot be broken down with the same ease and comfort to herself as in Turkey and Persia ; internal convulsion and ruin will accompany our degradation.

---

P.S.—The intelligence that has just reached this country, respecting the convulsion in the United States, will, alas, only excite gratification, through the animosity which the intelligence by the former packet aroused ;



they will fancy that the Government of the United States is weakened, and its power of aggression thereby paralyzed; they will imagine that the hour of dissolution is at hand, and complacently repeat that all danger for them is passed away. There is security for England only where there exists contentment at home and integrity. As there are elements for Russian ambition to work upon, only where there is internal discontent and external ambition. The more the internal bonds of union are weakened, the more will external aggression be palliated, excused, and adopted by American statesmen; who will see, in committing their country against England, a safety valve opened for internal discontent, and a bond presented to them, in the failure of all others, by those very designs which they had recently looked upon as subversive of their liberties, and destructive of their federal union.

---

June 20.

The President has continued to prosecute with unblushing daring his scheme; and the remedy which we suggested as alone available, namely,—IMPEACHMENT, has suggested itself to his compatriots. This has been declared by Chancellor Kent as the only course to be pursued, and as a course that must be pursued to preserve Constitution and Liberty.

As to the future,—the resistance awakened in the United States affords the Government of England time to regain their ground. If the English Government can now make up its mind to perform its duty,—if they declare they will hold the United States, on the annexation of Texas, bound by the Treaties lying upon Texas and Mexico—*abolition of slavery, liability for Mexican debt, and right of search*, they may, even without going to the point of defending Texas against the United States, or defending



Mexico against the one and the other, so strengthen internal resistance as not merely to frustrate the design, but even to restore the character of the United States, by bringing about the impeachment of this Great Criminal.

If the British Government fail in doing this, then have we no resource but the impeachment of *Lord Aberdeen*. Impeachments, it is true, require public virtue and public spirit. We say not that we possess the means of cure, but we declare what that cure is, and assert that there is none other.

The following extracts from the American papers will speak for themselves:—

“The permanent well-being of the American people, as well as public justice and self-respect, demand at the hands of the House of Representatives the immediate impeachment of John Tyler, for the high crimes and misdemeanors of which he has been guilty. We say this out of no feelings of detestation to his character, or of hatred to his person. We demand his impeachment as an act of justice, essential to the safety of the American republic. We believe the course of conduct he has pursued vitally hostile to the constitution, the laws, and liberties of the Union. How far soever he may be beneath the contempt of honest men, his acts in the high office whose powers he accidentally wields, are dangerous—infinately dangerous to the national safety; and the House of Representatives, in whose care the constitution has placed the public peace, rests under an obligation which it cannot shake off, to take such measures, as, in its best discretion, acting as the sworn agent of the national will, it may deem necessary for its preservation.

“It has been ascertained upon good authority, and the information is corroborated, so far as they go, by official documents, that Mr. Tyler has so disposed of a portion of the navy and army of the United States as to offer a forcible opposition, under the direction of the President of Texas, to the action of Mexico, should that government see fit to prosecute the lawful war in which it has been for several years engaged with the Republic of Texas. These offi-



cial orders, though those of them which have reached the public eye are drawn up in a guarded and cautious manner, taken in connection with the secret stipulations said on good authority to have been made, are equivalent, in all essential respects, to the commencement of a war with Mexico,—a nation with whom we have, in existing, unrepealed, and on their part, unviolated treaties, solemnly pledged our national faith and sacred honour to maintain relations of peace and friendship. Obedience to these orders will speedily plunge us into the horrors of actual hostility. The lives of American citizens will at once be sacrificed. The ships of American merchants will instantly be made the prey of privateers. The resources of our national treasury will be used for the slaughter of our allies. The peace of the world will be disturbed; the citizens of the United States involved in the horrors and responsibilities of an infamous war, and the escutcheon of the American Union blackened in the eyes of every Christian nation, with a disgrace more foul and damning than ever blotted the name of any civilized people on the face of the earth. These are not imaginary evils; they are the legitimate and inevitable results of obedience to the orders of the acting President. And these orders were given, involving as they do consequences of infinite and dreadful moment, not only in contempt of the will of the people of the United States, but without the knowledge, so far as appears, of a single member of either branch of the national legislature!”—*New York Courier and Enquirer*.

“What is the reasoning in favour of annexation? Confident expectation of a war with England as the basis—the facilities England would have in the possession of Texas for the prosecution of war against the United States, as the superstructure. There is the whole story.

“Now we confess, for our own part, that we are becoming heartily tired and ashamed of this perpetual bug-bearing about England by our public men. It manifests a paltry, miserable jealousy, coupled with a still more paltry fear, which might be pardoned in some petty German principality, but is most unbecoming in the great and powerful republic of the western continent. What is



there to justify us in this everlasting looking forward to war? Why cannot we place some little confidence in our strength, to say nothing of our just dealings with other nations and the just dealings of other nations with us? Why must we be for ever libelling the spirit of our own political institutions, whose end and aim and glory are all bound up with peace? Why do we, republicans, proclaimers and apostles of justice, progress, civilisation, and enlightenment—why do we prate eternally of that which is the deadliest foe to civilisation and progress?”—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

**DR. CHANNING IN 1834, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.**

“Some crimes, by their magnitude, have a touch of the sublime; and to this dignity the seizure of Texas by our citizens is entitled. Modern times furnish no example of individual rapine on so grand a scale. It is nothing less than the robbery of a realm. The pirate seizes a ship. The colonists and their coadjutors can satisfy themselves with nothing short of an empire. They have left their Anglo-Saxon ancestors behind them. Those barbarians conformed to the maxims of their age, to the rude code of nations in time of thickest heathen darkness. They invaded England under their sovereigns, and with the sanction of the gloomy religion of the North. But it is in a civilized age, and amidst refinements of manners;—it is amidst the lights of science and the teaching of Christianity, amidst expositions of the law of nations and enforcements of the law of universal love, amidst institutions of religion, learning, and humanity;—that the robbery of Texas has found its instruments. It is from a free, well-ordered, enlightened Christian country, that hordes have gone forth, in open day, to perpetrate this mighty wrong.

“We boast of our rapid growth, forgetting that, throughout nature, noble growths are slow. Our people throw them-



selves beyond the bounds of civilization, and expose themselves to relapses into a semi-barbarous state, under the impulse of wild imagination, and for the name of great possessions. Perhaps there is no people on earth on whom the ties of local attachment sit so loosely. Even the wandering tribes of Scythia are bound to one spot, the graves of their fathers; but the homes and graves of our fathers detain us feebly. The known and familiar is often abandoned for the distant and untrodden; and sometimes the untrodden is not the less eagerly desired because belonging to others. To this spirit we have sacrificed justice and humanity; and through its ascendancy, the records of this young nation are stained with atrocities, at which communities grown grey in corruption might blush.

“Texas is a country conquered by our citizens; and the annexation of it to our Union will be the beginning of conquests, which, unless arrested and beaten back by a just and kind providence, will stop only at the Isthmus of Darien. Henceforth we must cease to cry, Peace, peace. Our Eagle will whet, not gorge its appetite on its first victim; and will snuff a more tempting quarry, more alluring blood, in every new region which opens southward. To annex Texas is to declare perpetual war with Mexico. That word, *Mexico*, associated in men’s mind with boundless wealth, has already awakened rapacity. Already it has been proclaimed, that the Anglo-Saxon race is destined to the sway of this magnificent realm,—that the rude form of society, which Spain established there, is to yield and vanish before a higher civilization.

“A deadly hatred burns in Mexico towards this country. No stronger national sentiment now binds her scattered provinces together, than dread and detestation of Republican America. She is ready to attach herself to Europe for defence from the United States. All the moral power which we might have gained over Mexico, we have thrown away; and suspicion, dread, and abhorrence, have supplanted respect and trust.



“I am aware that these remarks are met by a vicious reasoning which discredits a people among whom it finds favour. It is sometimes said, that nations are swayed by laws, as unfailing as those which govern matter; that they have their destinies; that their character and position carry them forward irresistibly to their goal: that the stationary Turk must sink under the progressive civilization of Russia, as inevitably as the crumbling edifice falls to the earth; that, by a like necessity, the Indians have melted before the white man, and the mixed, degraded race of Mexico, must melt before the Anglo-Saxon. Away with this vile sophistry! There is no necessity for crime. There is no Fate to justify rapacious nations, any more than to justify gamblers and robbers, in plunder.

“Hitherto, I have spoken of the annexation of Texas as embroiling us with Mexico; but it will not stop here. It will bring us into collision with other states. It will, almost of necessity, involve us in hostility with European powers. Such are now the connexions of nations, that Europe must look with jealousy on a country, whose ambition, seconded by vast resources, will seem to place within her grasp the empire of the new world. And not only general considerations of this nature, but the particular relations of certain foreign states to this continent, must tend to destroy the peace now happily subsisting between us and the kingdoms of Europe. England, in particular, must watch us with suspicion, and cannot but resist our appropriation of Texas to ourselves. She has at once a moral and political interest in this question, which demands and will justify interference.

“England has a political as well as moral interest in this question. By the annexation of Texas we shall approach her liberated colonies; we shall build up a power in her neighbourhood, to which no limits can be prescribed. By adding Texas to our acquisition of Florida, we shall do much towards girdling the Gulf of Mexico; and I doubt not that some of our politicians will feel as if our mastery in that sea were sure. The West Indian Archipelago, in which the



European is regarded as an intruder, will, of course, be embraced in our over-growing scheme of empire. In truth, collision with the West Indies will be the most certain effect of the extension of our power in that quarter. The example, which they exhibit, of African freedom, of the elevation of the coloured race to the rights of men, is, of all influences, most menacing to slavery at the South. It must grow continually more perilous. These islands, unless interfered with from abroad, seem destined to be nurseries of civilization and freedom to the African race.

“ Will a slaveholding people, spreading along the shores of the Mexican Gulf, cultivate friendly sentiments towards communities, whose whole history will be a bitter reproach to their institutions, a witness against their wrongs, and whose ardent sympathies will be enlisted in the cause of the slave? Cruel, ferocious conflicts must grow from this neighbourhood of hostile principles, of communities regarding one another with unextinguishable hatred. All the islands of the Archipelago will have cause to dread our power; but none so much as the emancipated. Is it not more than possible, that wars, having for an object the subjugation of the coloured race, the destruction of this tempting example of freedom, should spring from the proposed extension of our dominion along the Mexican Gulf? Can England view our encroachments without alarm?

“ An English Minister would be unworthy of his office, who should see another state greedily swallow up territories in the neighbourhood of British colonies, and not strive, by all just means, to avert the danger.

“ By encroaching on Mexico, we shall throw her into the arms of European states, shall compel her to seek defence in transatlantic alliance. How plain is it, that alliance with Mexico will be hostility to the United States, that her defenders will repay themselves by making her subservient to their views, that they will thus strike root in her soil, monopolize her trade, and control her resources. And with what face can we resist the aggressions of others on our neighbour,



if we give an example of aggression? Still more if, by our advances, we put the colonies of England in new peril, with what face can we oppose her occupation of Cuba? Suppose her, with that magnificent island in her hands, to command the Mexican Gulf and the mouths of the Mississippi; will the Western States find compensation for this formidable neighbourhood, in the privilege of flooding Texas with slaves.

“Thus, wars with Europe and Mexico are to be entailed on us by the annexation of Texas. And is war the policy by which this country is to flourish? Was it for interminable conflicts that we formed our Union? Is it blood, shed for plunder, which is to consolidate our institutions? Is it by collision with the greatest maritime power, that we are to gain strength? Is it by arming against ourselves the moral sentiments of the world, that we are to build up national honour? Must we of the North buckle on our armour, to fight the battles of slavery; to fight for a possession, which our moral principles and just jealousy, forbid us to incorporate with our confederacy? In attaching Texas to ourselves, we provoke hostilities, and at the same time expose new points of attack to our foes. Vulnerable at so many points, we shall need a vast military force. Great armies will require great revenues, and raise up great chieftains. Are we tired of freedom, that we are prepared to place it under such guardians? Is the republic bent on dying by its own hands? Does not every man feel, that with war for our habit, our institutions cannot be preserved? If ever a country were bound to peace, it is this. Peace is our great interest. In peace our resources are to be developed, the true interpretation of the constitution to be established, and the interfering claims of liberty and order to be adjusted. In peace we are to discharge our great debt to the human race, and to diffuse freedom by manifesting its fruits. A country has no right to adopt a policy, however gainful, which, as it may foresee, will determine it to a career of war. A nation, like an individual, is bound to seek, even by sacrifices, a position, which will favour peace, justice, and the exercise of a beneficent influence on the world. A nation,



provoking war by cupidity, by encroachment, and above all, by efforts to propagate the curse of slavery, is alike false to itself, to God, and to the human race.

“This possession will involve us in new Indian wars. Texas, besides being open to the irruption of the tribes within our territories, has a tribe of its own, the Camanches, which is described as more formidable than any in North America. Such foes are not to be coveted. The Indians! that ominous word, which ought to pierce the conscience of this nation, more than the savage war-cry pierces the ear. The Indians! have we not inflicted and endured evil enough in our intercourse with this wretched people, to abstain from new wars with them? Is the tragedy of Florida to be acted again and again in our own day, and in our children’s?”

“But one thing does move me. It is a sore evil, that freedom should be blasphemed, that republican institutions should forfeit the confidence of mankind, through the unfaithfulness of this people to their trust.”

---

*(From the “Boundary Differences” in 1838.)*

“The New World was to read a political lesson to us of the old. May the moral of the old not be cast away on its young ambition—and, tainted already with crimes from which the oldest civilization recoils, let it not suppose that the experience of the past is not available for it, nor that retributive justice is to slumber over violence, because it is disguised as free, or excused as new.

“An apostle of national justice, worthy of better ages and of nobler times, has arisen among our descendants in the West. In the seclusion of remoteness—under the shade of privacy—engaged in the holy ministry of the altar—this extraordinary man has grasped the political relations of the old and the new world, with a precision, and exposed them with a power, which the land of his birth, as that of his ancestry, has hailed with cold and fruitless admiration.

“To attempt to exhibit to America the ruin of its character



—the destruction of its institutions—the downfall of its political existence—as the inevitable consequences of a career of aggression;—the deluging of Europe and America in blood, as the result of an insane purpose of greatness and dominion;— would be but to follow the argument exhausted by Dr. Channing. I refer to his letter on the Texas, to Mr. Clay;—from which, extensive as has been its circulation, I have extracted some passages—confident that those who have already read them will re-peruse them with increased interest and advantage.\*

“The attempt of Dr. Channing to arrest the spirit of violence, or the lust of plunder, amongst his countrymen, was made during the first aggressions upon a large scale against the Province of Mexico. He justly considered that event, not as an accident, but as the result of inherent national immorality, and as the commencement of a long series of future violence, wars, and disasters. His arguments bore on considerations of a moral kind; and on the misfortune which the United States, as a nation, was preparing for itself. These are his strong—his unassailable positions: having however established these, he proceeds to unrol before his countrymen another aspect of futurity;—he points out to them the certainty of collision with England, (although at that time, designs against the Canadas, nor aggressions upon the disputed territory, appeared in the distance, but as incidentally among a hundred other results of a purpose of aggression), and he pointed out the impossibility on the part of England, of submission to the assaults of the United States, or any people whatever: the imperative obligation resting on the British Cabinet, not merely to prevent an extension of her dominions, alarming to the peaceful relations of the world, but also to curb and repress, in the people of the United States, the spirit

\* I cannot omit stating that the question of the Texas, so far back as the year 1833, had engaged my most serious attention, and has been to me, looking to it from the shores of the Euxine, as the key to the events of the world.

The perusal of Dr. Channing's letter produced on me an electrical effect.—That such thoughts should in this age exist any where! That such views should proceed from America!



of aggression.—That spirit, easily arrested at its source, would be irresistible in the full current of its accumulated streams, and accelerated course. The responsible guardian of the interests and destinies of a neighbouring people, could not contemplate, without dismay, the development of such a spirit in America; nor avoid, without criminality, to use every just and honourable means to repress its growth, and resist its progress.

“ England has falsified the prognostics, and disproved the conclusions, of Dr. Channing. England has been heedless of the alarms which he entertained,—she has been blind to the motives he has exposed;—felt, or seemed to feel, no interest in the present or the future, to entertain no sense of duty, or instinct of preservation. England has thus abandoned Dr. Channing, with the friends, in America, of England and of peace, to the contempt of their compatriots. Those who, with him, alike respected England’s power and her intelligence, and who had raised their voices to say to their countrymen, ‘ Venture not there—it is unjust—it is moreover, ‘ injurious to England, and she will not suffer it,’ have learnt to disbelieve reason, or to despise England;—have learnt that nothing was too unjust for England to approve, and nothing too injurious for her to suffer.”

“ America has commenced to speak of war—to threaten England. Is this a result of the perversion of its own reason, or a justifiable conviction of the degradation of that of Great Britain? It is a natural result of long endurance of injustice, that they should threaten violence: but new inquiries will not fail to be made, and conclusions, startling to America, may be the result.

“ With a Government, weak in its central authority, disjointed in its constitutional power;—with a People, destitute of national patriotism, sacrificing every feeling to gain, and bending every faculty on acquisition,—disunited in popular sympathies, divided in immediate interests, distinct in ulterior aims,—haughty in the exaction of submission, suspicious in the yielding of authority,—untrained to war, unbroken to



discipline ;—with a Country, extended, unoccupied, exposed, —undefended by frontiers of difficulty, unprotected by fortresses of strength ;—with every neighbour a foe—a servile insurrection threatening within,—and the Indian prowling around, maddened by injustice, and desperate in revenge ;—to enter into war, except a war of necessity, and a war of justice, would be an act of madness, not a measure of policy.

“ Let us suppose, however, that collision takes place—let us suppose the United States re-enacting the tragedy of 1812, and marching her armies to the St. Lawrence. In the last war, when England was in arms against France (then mistress of Europe,) and could not send a single soldier to Canada, did not the United States incur defeat after defeat? Was not army after army captured? And did that power not reckon then on a bloodless triumph: and was not the result all but fatal to her political existence?

“ No elements of strength have grown up since then; no fortifying of popular judgment—no strengthening of executive authority :—the United States are, now, as weak as then: no better fitted to judge, and more liable to err,—to be carried away by popular passion, and to be acted on by foreign intrigue. The American Union is now more likely to plunge into war, because England ceases to steady its judgment, by imposing respect for justice; and less likely either to muster strength for the struggle, or to exhibit judgment in its conduct. What could America do against England?—Invade Canada? Does she conceive that the conquest of Canada can be effected, except with the destruction of the power of Great Britain: or that England, recalling her energies, as she has always done in war, will not bring them all to bear on a contest for existence;—strike the Union at all points at once, and by the weapons the most dreadful—legalized by necessity.”

“ Thus demoralized, their first step was to re-enact on the Indian, the lessons of injustice they had learnt from their parental state. Each district brought into cultivation—each successive extension of territory and dominion, was extorted



by violence, or abstracted by fraud, from the 'lords of the soil;' and each successive wave of population, as it spread in a widened circle around, marked its flow with blood. The settlement of the new race upon the virgin soil, was effected by the extirpation of the charities of nature, and the outrage of the rights of man.

"Among the chief sources of American weakness, —glaring amidst the proofs of constitutional fallacy and of human injustice, is the state of the Negro, and the condition of the coloured race. But here, too, has not England with humiliation to remember, that that system was her system,—that the crime of which she has ceased to be guilty, had been by her transmitted to her American progeny, as a principle of law, and an hereditary possession.

"A popular opinion arose in the southern portion of the Union, in favour of invading the neighbouring country; and that measure was announced, adopted, and carried into effect, in the manner of a proposal touching some municipal or parochial regulation. Public opinion justified it; a free press advocated it; and a people proud of their institutions carried it into effect: exhibiting a departure from those ordinary feelings of integrity and honour which had hitherto been admitted in common by all men,—and, at the same time, a disregard for the existing authority of the State, which I believe has never before occurred in the history of man; for even rebellion in the old world has been united by a principle or controlled by a leader. Dr. Channing asks whether they are prepared to take the new position in the world of a 'robber state:—but robbers have never yet been known destitute of authority among themselves. What prospect does such an event present to the neighbours of the United States? What prospect for itself? England,—whose interests in the independence of Mexico were not less than her interests in the independence of this Island,—extends no protecting shield before that State; articulates no word to save it from this disaster—the American people from this guilt—the American Government from this degradation. Yet, one word would



have sufficed. England—whose most anxious efforts ought to have been directed, and whose whole power, if necessary, ought to have been exerted, to arrest the progress of a spirit of aggression in the United States,—carefully avoids the indication of any interest or of any opinion on that subject; when an expression of her intention and her determination would have effectually overawed and repressed that spirit. She is indeed the first to hail, and first to confirm, the triumph of this injustice.

“The United States, thus mentally constituted, thus morally instructed, next turned the lawlessness of their ambition, directed with the cunning of the Indian, against Great Britain herself. And here again has Great Britain to bear the disgrace of their attempts, and the penalty of their success. Her contemptible submission was the cause of their boldness. the justification of their injustice, by yielding up every contested right, and sanctioning each advanced pretension.

“Commutations take place in Canada: the people of the North, emulating those of the South, look on Canada as a new Texas, on England as another Mexico. Armed bands proceed to carry war into the provinces of a friendly power; and constituted authorities applaud, support, and co-operate. England, differing in this respect from Mexico, finds excuses for such acts in ‘the constitutional difficulties’ of the Government of the United States;—the perpetrators, when discomfited, withdraw in peace to their homes, experiencing, and fearing, no retribution from the power they have offended, or from the state to which they belong: and, instructed by the ‘harmony prevailing between the two Governments,’ consider such acts as honourable enterprises.—Then follows,—the new assault on the disputed territory.”

“It is because England has been false to herself, that the United States have not been true to their own interests. It is because England is allied to her foes, that the United States have been false to her. The interests of both are then identical. England, by the assertion of her own rights and the performance of her own duties, can still preserve both.”



(The same writer, twelve years ago, in illustrating the causes of the instability of European Governments, thus alludes to Texas):—

“The Mexican government being unable to protect or occupy the Texas, granted a large tract of that splendid province to American settlers, who became subjects of the Mexican republic—this opened to Mexico the prospect of many and important advantages; the confirmation, by occupation, of its right to the province, the protection of its frontier from the Indians, the augmentation of its population and territorial resources, and, above all, the formation of a population towards the United States, possessing the characteristic energy of its population, and eminently capable of resisting its encroachments. For the supply of their wants, and the disposal of their produce, the settlers found it convenient to establish a yearly caravan with Louisville. A barbarous Turkish administration would have thought that the province could best understand its own wants; but the Mexican government had not emancipated itself from the prejudices of Europe. The sequel may easily be anticipated—prohibition of the caravan, contempt of the settlers for orders that could not be enforced, measures to prevent further settlements, and animosity deeply implanted, which, of course, will end in the loss of the province to Mexico.”—*Turkey and its Resources*.

THE END.







(The same writer, twelve years ago, in illustrating the causes of the instability of European Governments, thus alludes to Texas):—

“The Mexican government being unable to protect or occupy the Texas, granted a large tract of that splendid province to American settlers, who became subjects of the Mexican republic—this opened to Mexico the prospect of many and important advantages; the confirmation, by occupation, of its right to the province, the protection of its frontier from the Indians, the augmentation of its population and territorial resources, and, above all, the formation of a population towards the United States, possessing the characteristic energy of its population, and eminently capable of resisting its encroachments. For the supply of their wants, and the disposal of their produce, the settlers found it convenient to establish a yearly caravan with Louisville. A barbarous Turkish administration would have thought that the province could best understand its own wants; but the Mexican government had not emancipated itself from the prejudices of Europe. The sequel may easily be anticipated—prohibition of the caravan, contempt of the settlers for orders that could not be enforced, measures to prevent further settlements, and animosity deeply implanted, which, of course, will end in the loss of the province to Mexico.”—*Turkey and its Resources*.

THE END.



Urquhart, David,

Annexation of the Texas a case of war between England and the United  
States

London 1844

J.publ.e. 473 wt-6

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11008960-8